

# THE FORTNIGHTLY

MAY, 1947

## EUROPEAN RECOVERY

BY SIR HAROLD BUTLER

**J**UST two years have passed since the German war ended. At that time Europe, with the exception of the neutrals, was prostrate. Large sections of Poland, Hungary, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Greece, Austria, Italy, France, Holland, Norway, Belgium and Luxemburg had been laid waste—to say nothing of Germany—livestock slaughtered, machinery smashed up or removed, factories destroyed, fields untilled. Millions of people had died or disappeared. Great hordes of men, women and children, running perhaps to fifteen or twenty millions, were on the move: released prisoners of war, labour conscripts carried off to Germany from Russia and every occupied country, German refugees who had fled before the Soviet armies from all over Eastern Europe or who were being ruthlessly expelled by the Poles and the Czechs, Jews fleeing before the fear of new pogroms. The internal stability of every belligerent country was more or less deeply disturbed, offering a prospect of widespread disorder, in some cases perhaps of civil war and anarchy. Starvation and epidemic on a large scale were generally anticipated.

When one recalls this state of things as it existed at the time of the armistice, there is good ground for feeling that the present condition of the continent is certainly better than was then feared. There has been no general breakdown of European society, but on the whole progress out of chaos towards economic recovery and political stabilization. That does not mean that either economic or political stability has yet been attained. After an upheaval of such vast proportions, that could not possibly have been achieved in so short a time. As we can judge by our own plight, many years of hard work will be needed to restore industry and agriculture to full productivity, to make good the shortages of food, clothing and houses, and to revive the flow of trade along new and old channels. Political commotion and civil strife still exist in some countries. The old political structure of Europe has been destroyed. To rebuild it upon a solid foundation may require several decades.

It is therefore much too soon to attempt any assessment of the future destiny of Europe, but a cursory survey of what has been accomplished may lessen the tendency to pessimism and may even suggest some ground for restrained hope. An immense amount of work has in fact been done both by the Allies and by the European peoples themselves, which is gradually bearing fruit. Even at the end of an exceptionally hard winter, which at this juncture is a particularly cruel stroke of fortune, confidence is slowly beginning to return.

The first balance to be struck is on the economic side. As long as misery and want are widespread, it would be idle to expect political tranquillity. The vast majority of Europeans passed through six years of strain and anguish, which left them nervously and physically exhausted. In such a condition they were naturally exposed to the fears and agitations which drive people to desperate courses. These emotions can only be allayed by a gradual return to normal conditions of living—a regular supply of the elementary necessities, some prospect of continued improvement, the belief that effort will not be cheated of its reward. In other words, what most of them long for beyond everything else is a quiet life, which will allow them to recover their equilibrium and to repair their personal fortunes. I believe that this sentiment is universal and overwhelming, far stronger than any impulse towards fresh ideological adventure. Every sign of decreasing privation and better times ahead will encourage and strengthen it. That is why economic recovery is the first indispensable step towards a new and stable political order.

What then has been done in the direction of economic rehabilitation? The first brunt was borne by UNRRA, to which far too little credit has been given. As usual with international bodies, its occasional shortcomings have been trumpeted and its extensive successes overlooked. It was created to do a stop-gap job, which it has performed admirably within the limits of its powers and its money. It was able to step in with food and equipment when eastern Europe was in a catastrophic state. But for its aid there might have been a total breakdown in White Russia and the Ukraine, in Poland, Greece and Yugoslavia. Its assistance gave Austria, Italy and Czechoslovakia an invaluable start on the road to recovery. Without the medical staffs and supplies of UNRRA epidemic disease must have assumed far greater proportions. In fact, Governor Lehman and his colleagues tided the worst-hit regions of Europe over their most critical period. It is a thousand pities and a political mistake that they were not allowed to complete their task by another year's work. Though it was an international body, seventy per cent. of its funds were furnished by the United States and nearly the whole of the balance by Britain. The salvage of eastern Europe was therefore almost entirely the work of the western powers and their help was freely given in the devastated areas of Russia. To this must be added the credits granted by the Export-Import Bank of the United States to Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Greece, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, and Poland, amounting to \$2,310,000,000 and smaller loans furnished by Britain and Canada, to say nothing of the large sums of British and American money spent on essential imports for Germany. These facts indicate how much Europe has owed to the western powers and how calamitous its condition would have been without them.

In western Europe the smaller countries have displayed extraordinary resilience. Belgium, Denmark, Luxemburg, the Netherlands and Norway are well along the upward path. None of these countries would claim to be out of the



wood, but the trees are much thinner than they were two years ago and the daylight is beginning to show through. Confidence is rapidly growing, much encouraged by political stability. In spite of the revolutionary turmoil of the times, the monarchies of these five countries are probably more securely based than before the war. During the years of occupation they formed the rallying point of the resistance movements. After liberation, by carrying out their constitutional rôle honestly and impartially, they enabled ordinary parliamentary life to be resumed smoothly. These countries were therefore spared the travail of constitution-making, which has distracted the political life of France and Italy. They just went back to their traditional habits of democratic government, which have proved an adequate bulwark against extremist adventures either to left or right. This sense of political normality has been a strong sedative to the nerves of these peoples. They have been able to settle down to work without bothering their heads too much about politics. In that lies much of the secret of their recovery. It is hardly necessary to add that Switzerland and Sweden are prosperous and stable. Their trouble is too much money rather than too little. This gives them an enviable distinction in an impoverished continent, but also an opportunity to assist its restoration by lending money and buying its exports, which the Swiss in particular are doing freely.

It may be said then that the smaller western countries are doing pretty well, but the same is not so true of France and Italy. Neither has yet fully regained its political or economic balance, but when one considers the disastrous impact of war and defeat upon them, one may venture to think that they are through the worst. After a period of confusion, during which the danger of revolutionary upheaval was always present, there are signs that both countries are beginning to settle down to the tremendous task of reconstruction. Economically France suffers from many of the same evils as Britain—extensive war-damage, loss of foreign investments, shortage of man-power, worn-out and antiquated plant, high costs of production, dependence on imports of coal, oil, copper, cotton and wool, disorganization of large sections of industry by the transition from private to national ownership. She has borrowed £480,000,000 in the United States, of which the greater part had been expended by the end of last year. On the credit side, however, can be set the restoration of road and railway communications, which had been completely disrupted by the war, the reconditioning of the devastated ports, and steadily rising production of coal, iron, steel, textiles and agricultural produce. But the future is staked on the execution of the Monnet Plan, a comprehensive scheme for rebuilding the national economy worked out by combined teams of officials, industrialists and trade-unionists. It has two great merits. It is non-partizan, and it does not attempt to disguise the seriousness of the situation; it offers a plain choice "between gradual decadence and immediate action." But its success depends upon the willingness of the French investor to provide the huge capital sums needed to restock and to re-equip the country. If he has sufficient confidence

in the franc and in the future of France, the goal can be reached, but a real start can hardly be made until the black market and the inflationary rise of prices have been effectually curbed. The French position is still anxious, but the French have frequently displayed astonishing powers of recuperation in the past, and those who know them best expect them to do so once again.

Italy had to begin its painful ascent from an even lower level of political and economic confusion. Like France, it was torn by bitter internal dissensions, but has managed to check the forces of disruption, which would have been fatal to recovery. After a short period of demoralization and despair, the Italians began to work hard. By the end of 1946 railway-traffic was nearing its pre-war level. Industrial recovery, though badly hampered by lack of British and German coal, was well under way. Agriculture had reached seventy-five per cent. of its normal production. Foreign trade was reviving with unexpected rapidity. There is an abundance of man-power, and the finances, though left in a desperate state by the fascists and the havoc of the war, may be slowly restored to solvency by austerity and sacrifice, especially as they are no longer burdened by heavy armaments or unproductive colonies. Though the Peace Treaty was immensely unpopular, there is no reason why it should prejudice economic recuperation. Italy cannot regain the status of a great power, which she was never strong enough to support, but her chances of overcoming her difficulties, which two years ago looked insuperable, are by no means hopeless.

On the whole the outlook for the west is better than might have been expected, but in the centre of Europe lies a yawning vacuum. There can be no complete rehabilitation of the economy of the continent, until Germany is once more an integral part of it. Whether as producers or consumers, its seventy million people are a factor with which it cannot dispense. Nothing is impeding the resuscitation of Europe so much as lack of coal. Britain, which formerly supplied about thirty-four per cent. of Europe's imports, is making no contribution, a fact which gravely weakens both her political and her economic influence on the continent. In these circumstances German coal is more than ever necessary for the Low Countries, France, Switzerland and Italy, but German exports, which formerly provided forty per cent. of Europe's requirements, are now reduced by more than half. Until they not only regain their old level but greatly exceed it, there will be a parlous lack of coal and power crippling the revival of western industry. But the east has also need of Germany. Before the war it supplied a large part of the agricultural machinery and the fertilizers used by the agrarian countries, which in their turn found a market for their surplus foodstuffs in Germany with its large industrial cities. Though Dr. Schacht pushed this exchange to exorbitant lengths, it is nevertheless a natural two-way channel of trade. Germany cannot be fed or feed itself indefinitely in dollar markets. The principal alternative is eastern Europe, when it once more produces enough to be able to export food. Once



the U.S.S.R. has surmounted its agricultural crisis, it will not need the cereals or the livestock of Hungary, Rumania and Yugoslavia, nor in view of its own problem of re-equipment, can it supply them with the tractors and other equipment, of which they are in urgent need. Britain may well do something towards meeting their requirements and absorbing their exports, but in the long run it is difficult to see how they can enjoy real prosperity without resuming their pre-war trade with Germany.

This is not the place to discuss the problems, which have been debated in Moscow—to what extent German industry can be safely rebuilt, how it can be effectively controlled, how it can be made to serve Europe, not to master it. But already there seems to be general agreement that it is an indispensable factor for European reconstruction, and to judge from the Soviet insistence on reparations in kind, for Russian reconstruction also. To many this may seem a paradoxical, even repugnant, conclusion to our efforts to annihilate German power, but it is an inescapable economic fact. German industry is an asset without which Europe cannot hope to enjoy its old prosperity again, still less to enhance it. If German energies and skills were devoted to peaceful uses, and if Germans themselves came to see that their dreams of domination are dead past recall, a new chapter in the economic life of Europe might be opened. Instead of standing aloof as a hostile force threatening its neighbours both east and west, Germany might find in time a useful and appropriate place in the European community. These are no doubt distant speculations with little relevance to the present phase of European recovery. But on the longer view it is clear that the future of Europe hinges largely on the ability of the Allies and the Germans to solve the problem of reconditioning German industry as part of the European economic system.

This rapid survey may be concluded with a brief glance at the east. It is perhaps too readily assumed that the countries of the eastern bloc will be progressively absorbed in the Soviet orbit. Their liberation by the Red Army and their sense of Slav kinship made it inevitable that Czechoslovakia, Poland, Yugoslavia and Bulgaria should, though in different degrees, be drawn politically towards Moscow, but it must not be forgotten that the two former at any rate were strongly imbued with the ideas of western liberalism and have a long history of association with the west. It must also be remembered that the three latter had suffered severely under oligarchical dictatorships and from the chronic depression of agriculture, which predisposed large sections of the population to welcome communism, which they had been led to believe would cure all their ills. There are at present various signs of disillusionment and of a consequent reaction, but without attaching too much importance to them, the economic position of all four countries suggests that they must look westwards as well as eastwards for the means of recovery.

Both the Czechs and the Poles have gone about the work of reconstruction with determination. They have both nationalized their principal industries

and are wrestling with the problem of finding adequate planning and technical staffs. In addition, the Czechs have incurred a serious economic loss by the expulsion of two and a half million Sudeten Germans, including many of the ablest technicians and most skilled workers in the country. The Poles have had to cope with the colossal problem of transferring over three million people from the lost eastern provinces to the newly acquired German lands in the west, and to make good the terrible ravages of three campaigns on their territory. In spite of these handicaps both countries have made considerable strides with the assistance of UNRRA. Last year industrial production in Czechoslovakia attained to seventy-five per cent. of the pre-war figure and in spite of high prices foreign trade was reviving but, as before the war its best markets lie in the west rather than in the east. It is significant that in 1946 only twelve per cent. of its exports went to Russia, a smaller proportion than to Switzerland. Poland, now on the way to becoming an industrial country of some importance thanks to the acquisition of the Silesian industries, is looking for outlets in the west for its coal and its agricultural produce, as it becomes available for export. It produced forty-seven million tons of coal last year and expects to reach a total of eighty millions in two years' time—a sound basis for its new economy. But both countries need much new machinery and equipment, both industrial and agricultural, which the U.S.S.R. cannot furnish while its resources are severely taxed to meet its own needs. The Czechs and the Poles have therefore turned their eyes to the United States. Though nothing has yet materialized, their predicament affords another illustration of the economic pull of the west.

The countries of the south-east present a much less encouraging picture. The state of Greece still remains precarious. The harvests of Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia were drastically reduced by the drought. In all these countries political unrest and uncertainty is checking the impulse to recovery. The effects of the nationalization of industry and the land reforms have not been fully assimilated. There is a shortage of agricultural implements and machinery which only the west can supply, but for which no means of payment are at present in sight. The problem of rural over-population and pauperism is still far from solution. The peasants appear to be recalcitrant to the introduction of collective methods of farming and to the state-regulation of agriculture, while the capital resources necessary for any far-reaching plans for industry are wholly deficient.

From the foregoing sketch it can be seen that the European picture is a chequer of light and shadow. Without the extensive help given by the western powers by means of credits and by their contributions to UNRRA, the shadows would be much blacker. And yet cries of protest are raised in communist quarters against any British or American assistance as denoting sterling or dollar "imperialism". Before the war Europe was weakened and impoverished by economic warfare springing from an exaggerated nationalism. In its present debilitated condition ideological warfare could be even more fatal to



its hopes of revival. Doctrinal shibboleths could block the flow of capital and goods as effectively as the old trade-barriers. If loans and commercial agreements are simply looked upon as weapons in the barren war of political creeds, Europe is unlikely to recover its economic balance for a generation at least. If it is now divided by ideological strife as it was formerly divided by national hatreds and rivalries, its last state will be much worse than the first.

But there is another alternative. In the past no attempt was made to develop its communications, its electric power and its industrial resources on a continental scale—the only scale which could bring real prosperity to its 300 million people. The few schemes which were broached were quickly discounted on strategical or political grounds. The Germans regarded "*PanEuropa*" as a convenient slogan for promoting their hegemony in Europe, which was an adequate reason for rejecting it. The situation is different now. Under Allied supervision there is a possibility of giving Germany her due place without fear of her becoming predominant. There is no lack of man-power or technical ability in Europe. If they were applied to promoting its development on modern scientific lines, the productivity of the continent could be transformed in a comparatively short time. A few successful experiments in this kind of co-operative effort would probably revolutionize the European approach to its economic problems. As a beginning there is no need to discuss a customs-union or a European five-year plan. More practical results are likely to come from more limited regional or local projects. There is a wide field for the systematic exploitation of minerals and hydro-electric power. The low output of the peasant in eastern Europe cannot be raised without a considerable outlay on railways, roads, bridges, machinery, irrigation and drainage, without better organization of crops and markets and better technical education. All these things demand capital resources beyond the reach of the countries immediately concerned. Much also could be done in the way of unifying industrial regions at present unnaturally divided by customs barriers, of which north-eastern France, the Rhineland and the Low Countries are a classic instance. The Dutch and the Belgians have already taken a first step by progressively diminishing their tariff-walls. The United Nations has now succeeded in setting afoot its European Commission, which can play a vital part in helping to plan and to finance the regeneration of Europe on comprehensive lines. Backed by the authority of such an international body, the task can be done. Without it particular interests and political antagonisms will continue to thwart recovery. The fate of Europe depends partly upon its own efforts, but even more upon the agreement between the western powers and the Soviet Union to promote the unity and the prosperity of the stricken continent.

*(The author, who was Secretary-General of the International Labour Conference, Washington, in 1919, and Director of the International Labour Office from 1932 to 1938, has recently returned from his post as Minister to H.M. Embassy at Washington.)*

## THE MILITARY GOVERNMENT OF GERMANY (II)

BY W. FRIEDMANN

THE broad and necessarily simplified analysis attempted in the previous article\* could not but register a failure of military government, after the first two years of operation, measured against the almost inconceivable magnitude of the task. No one can rest content with such an analysis. The need to save what there is to be saved is inescapably bound up with the fight for peace. Many of the hopes entertained at the time of Germany's capitulation for the reconstruction of peaceful Germany, through a form of joint control which might be the beginning of genuine international government, are buried. Above all, the brief and historic moment—the first six or eight months of the occupation—during which the German people at large were unconditionally ready to believe not only in the physical superiority of the Allies but in the superiority of their ideas, has gone. Moreover, certain major changes initiated under the Allied occupation of the last two years, limit freedom of action now. Prussia has been dissolved, and a Germany consisting of a large number of states, some of them entirely new, is emerging. A de-Nazification machinery of gigantic proportions, sifting the vast majority of the population into black, grey and white, has been at work for nearly two years. The economic machine for Germany, temporarily disrupted at the time of capitulation, is now virtually at a standstill. Such factors limit the alternatives now open for a solution of the German problem.

Among the multitude of problems a few are fundamental. They are: first, the constitutional structure of Germany; secondly, Germany's future economic level and structure; thirdly, her social structure, and fourthly, the question of the limits of control and the extent to which Germans should again decide their own affairs. The question of "re-education" is not a separate matter. It permeates and underlies all specific problems.

(1) *The Constitutional Structure.* The complete collapse of central government, and the piece-meal administration of Germany in separate zones, made it inevitable that the highest constitutional and administrative units were the *Länder* and provinces. There is interminable discussion about the merits and dangers of federalism for Germany. But the fact is that all four occupying powers have adopted the identical policy of constituting their major units as *Länder*. The British zone now has four of these: by far the biggest and most important is Rhineland-Westphalia combining the former

\* The Military Government of Germany by W. Friedmann. April 1947.



Prussian province of Westphalia with that part of the Rhine province which is not in the French zone. The second is the newly created *Land* Niedersachsen, combining the former Prussian province of Hanover with the small historical *Länder* of Oldenburg, Braunschweig and Lippe. The third is the former Prussian province of Schleswig-Holstein, and the fourth is the ancient free city of Hamburg. The smaller Hanseatic city of Bremen is also constituted as a *Land* but, being the port of entry to the American zone, and also in order to balance the number of constitutional units in the bi-zonal set-up, Bremen counts as part of the U.S. zone. Apart from Bremen, the U.S. zone consists of three *Länder*: Bavaria, which has remained entirely intact, Greater Hesse—a combination of the former *Land* Hesse, and the Prussian Province of Hessen-Nassau annexed to Prussia under Bismarck—and the northern parts of Württemberg and Baden which are combined in one *Land*. The French zone has left the southern part of Württemberg and Baden as separate *Länder*; but it has created an entirely new unit out of the southern parts of the Rhine Province, and the Palatinate with the addition of a small slice of Hessen on the right bank of the Rhine. The Saar territory, now considered to all intents and purposes as French, is separate and has been increased by a small slice from the southern tip of the Rhine Province. The Russians, despite all their protests against federalization, have also converted all their units into *Länder*. They are the former *Länder* of Thuringia, Saxony and Mecklenburg, and the former Prussian provinces of Brandenburg and Saxony now converted into *Länder* (the latter under the name of Sachsen-Anhalt). There remains Berlin which always had a special constitutional status. It is now divided into four sectors each controlled by one occupying power. On the German side they are combined under the City Administration of Berlin responsible, in its turn, to a special Allied authority, the *Kommandantura*,\* which may be described as a special edition of the Allied Control Council, with rather more executive authority and some more concrete administrative achievements. The sectors themselves are partly considered as appendages of the four zones from which they are separated by hundreds of miles (except for the Russian sector which therefore enjoys some advantages over the others); partly as administrative sections of one unit, the City of Berlin. Until some time ago the tendency towards joint and integral government of the different parts of Berlin was on the increase. Since then there has been a deplorable trend in the opposite direction. A firm situated in one sector is now often forbidden to supply its subsidiary in another sector even with spare parts. Such matters become often the subject of complicated inter-allied negotiations. Each sector has its separate system of courts. Nowhere is the lack of Allied unity and the disintegration of Germany illustrated more vividly.

In fact, therefore, Germany to-day consists of seventeen federal units without

\* A word carefully chosen so as not to be part of any existing language but to be understandable to all four occupying powers.

federal government.\* The proposals of the four Allied powers in Moscow do not fundamentally differ on the principle of decentralization, that is the reconstruction of Germany on a basis of medium sized states, with a central administration limited to functions far more restricted than any exercised by a German government since the reconstitution of the *Reich*. There is far less clarity, though apparently vague agreement on the need to constitute central government functions by delegation from the *Länder* rather than the other way round. This is certainly the American conception. The Americans go to the utmost length in emphasizing the autonomy of the *Länder*. They will sacrifice almost anything to this construction, and in the bi-zonal administration have throughout insisted on ultimate reference of any bi-zonal decision to the Prime Minister of the *Länder*, although the *Länder* themselves form the bi-zonal Committees. The British started differently. Pending the establishment of a central administration for Germany, they had proceeded to establish zonal authorities for such matters as economics, food, transport, labour, with the power of direction over the *Länder*. The zonal authorities were conceived as stake holders for a future central German administration. At the very moment when this scheme was beginning to work effectively, the fusion with the American zone led to the dissolution of the zonal authorities and the almost complete adoption of the American principle. Even now however, the British do not go to the length of referring any bi-zonal decision back to the Prime Ministers of the constituent *Länder*. In the French zone, the problem of central versus *Land* authority has hardly arisen; there are not yet any German zonal authorities with executive powers; the French authorities at Baden-Baden are the government for the French zone. The Russians, on the other hand, were far ahead of all the other zones in constituting central administrations for the Russian zone at Berlin. These authorities have, however, little effective power over the *Länder*. They can do little more than recommend and co-ordinate. Unity in the zone is essentially achieved through the commands of military government and through the predominance of the Socialist Unity Party. As a result, the constitutions of the *Länder* in the Russian zone resemble each other very closely.

The emphasis therefore is so far entirely on decentralization and *Land* authority. The essential problem is still unsolved and it does not seem to have been clearly approached in any of the Allied proposals at Moscow. The key problem to-day is the need for effective economic planning, including production priorities and a fair distribution of raw materials and essential consumer goods. These will be in desperate scarcity for years to come. No system which leaves the decision on these matters to seventeen separate units

---

\* Of the major new *Länder*, Greater Hesse and Niedersachsen constitute definite advances towards a healthy regional reorganization of Germany. Rhineland-Westphalia is oversized and over-industrialized in relation to the rest. The different states made out of Württemberg and Baden are monstrosities produced by the unnatural frontiers between the French and U.S. zones.



of quite unequal size and resources can hope to achieve the essentials of economic planning. It was the recognition of this need which led to the establishment of zonal authorities in the British zone. It is the failure to solve this problem which has so far thwarted the bi-zonal administrations in the combined British-U.S. zone.

The executive apparatus and administration should be with the *Länder*. They should also be associated with the decisions on economic planning. In the British proposals submitted at Moscow, for example, the second chamber would represent the *Länder* as such, with a suspensory veto on legislation. But any scheme which leaves the ultimate decision on production and distribution to each *Land* separately cannot but lead to chaos and disintegration. It may be that the Allies, and in particular the Americans with their fanatical insistence on land autonomy, have sown dragon teeth. To-day, in the bi-zonal administration, Bavaria, with her relative surplus of food, flatly refuses to supply the north on which she depends for her coal and other industrial goods. The bi-zonal administration has no power to impose sanctions, in the form of withholding supplies from Bavaria. Eventually military government may have to use compulsion. Here, as in many other fields, Allied policy in Germany has been almost opposite to that generally prevailing in the world. Everywhere, federal governments have been compelled to acquire increased competences in economic planning. Nowhere are they more desperately needed than in Germany but nowhere are there greater difficulties, with the creation of dozens of new ministries, administrations and vested interests in particularism. It is true that economic planning powers imply a danger of centralism. But in the present condition of Germany, this danger fades into insignificance compared with the desperate need for a minimum standard of living. The bi-zonal authorities are denied the minimum legal powers necessary to enforce elementary controls, because they are executive authorities not responsible to democratic Parliaments. Yet it is the Allies who have so far refused to establish a bi-zonal State! The resulting half-way house makes the effective transfer of executive responsibility to German authorities almost impossible. The apparent failure of the Moscow Conference to agree on a Central Administration makes the issue still more urgent. Either through delegation from Military Government or through the creation of a Western State the bi-zonal agencies will have to get the necessary control functions.

It must be the purpose of all the Allies to give the remnants of Germany a reasonable chance to live mainly by their own work and fair distribution of resources. This means basic economic planning powers over raw materials, food, industrial priorities, prices and transport at the centre. The alternative is that a number of separate units will be the playball of European power politics, repeating the history of Germany of previous centuries. They may coalesce into a western and an eastern German bloc; neither of them can live on its own resources. They would inevitably be integrated in rival western

and eastern European economic and political systems, or remain ruinous charges on the occupying powers. It is already clear that the combination of the western zones, by itself, can do little to alleviate the fundamental economic plight. It must depend on vital imports to live and it can never be self-sufficient in food.

Few people, other than ardent German nationalists would shed a tear on the disappearance of Germany as a political unit if the alternative were the emergence of smaller contented and peaceful units. Nor does anyone quarrel with the need for a decisive shift from central to a decentralized structure; but what has happened so far is a type of German disintegration which will make Germany both the playball of international conflicts and an economic chaos in which some parts will live in reasonable prosperity and others in abject misery.

How do the Germans themselves feel about this issue? They appear to be confused and divided. One of the cardinal political weaknesses of Germany is their hovering between an excessive disciplined centralism, and the petty particularism which has characterized German history for so long. Both tendencies are alive to-day. Many Germans in the west, particularly those with an anti-Russian complex, frankly prefer the detachment of western Germany but only if she can join a western European federation. There is also the special case of Bavaria, now strengthened in her traditional particularism by her relatively favourable food position. But Mr. Molotov is certainly right in insisting that any Allied scheme which favours particularism (especially if it impedes a reasonable distribution of economic necessities) will strengthen German nationalism and centralism of a defiant character. Here, as so often, Britain seems to have sacrificed too many of her sound conceptions to brilliant but dangerous American constructions.

(2) *The Economic Problem.* The Allies at Moscow seem to agree, in principle, on the need for a decisive upward revision of the level of German industry. They are at loggerheads over two other issues: First, the desirability of any further dismantling of German industry and, secondly, the question of reparations out of current production, as a priority charge ranking before the repayment of Allied advances to western Germany out of current production and exports. The Russians, having dismantled on a large scale in their zone, demand far-reaching dismantling in the western zone and priority payment of their own reparations taken out of bulk removals of plant, current production and foreign assets. In this, they combine the objective of weakening the industrial potential of the west with that of rebuilding their own shattered economy. Britain regards the cost of occupation, including necessary imports, as the first charge, ranking before reparations. I think that the vast majority of Allied administrators in Germany as well as of Germans would regard the dismantling issue as the more fundamental. On reparation priorities a compromise should be possible. Russia has suffered grievously and there has been at least basic agreement on reparations at Yalta and Potsdam. To the western Allies,



especially to America, a delay in the repayment of credits and supplies cannot be quite as vital as the maintenance of some coherence and unity in the administration of Germany. But both Mr. Bevin and Mr. Marshall have rightly been adamant on the question of further dismantling and destruction of productive capacity in the state which Germany has reached and until a vital change takes place in the methods of control. This is sound on technical, as well as on economic and psychological grounds. Except for certain specific war industries no one has found a satisfactory technical distinction between war and peace industries, and Mr. Molotov has admitted that much at Moscow.

On the economic issue, Mr. Marshall has pointed out that the cutting off of Germany's most important agricultural area compels the increase let alone the maintenance of existing industrial capacity. It has already been suggested in the previous article that the whole principle of fixing a special industrial level—which may have to be revised almost every year—should be given up and replaced by effective control of key materials and field inspection of key industries. The danger of a too powerful industrial Germany is to-day very remote as against the vital and imminent danger of a mass of desperate people herded together with little food and no hope. The cost to the Allies, in terms of money, security, occupation forces and moral prestige is infinitely greater. Most important of all probably is the psychological issue. No one who has witnessed the psychological effect of the threatened closing down, for example, of the Hoesch works in Dortmund or of the blowing up of the Blohm & Voss dockyards in Hamburg can have any illusions on this score. Such actions alienate the workers, that is, the core of democratic elements in Germany, far more than the owners. The latter, at any rate, have usually some property to fall back on. The worker has nothing; for even the original scarcity of labour has now largely disappeared; there is hidden unemployment on an increasing scale, firms hold on to their skilled workers despite lack of work, other than maintenance, in the hope of something happening to allow resumption of production. There are of course vast and pressing needs to be satisfied. Housing reconstruction alone could employ hundreds of thousands for many years. But the materials are wanting and the materials will not be forthcoming until the limits on production are withdrawn.

One factor, which is both economic and political, has not so far been stressed with sufficient frankness. To no other occupying power does the problem of re-activation of industry present a graver problem than to Britain. Russia can absorb her zone into her own orbit, without much fear of over-production or competition. The French need more production and have gladly re-activated the Saar industry. To the Americans, the southern zone which is, in any case not heavily industrialized, is no major economic problem. But the British have a zone which lives or dies by industry and a type of production potentially competitive to British industry (except—at least for some years—for coal). The iron and steel, textile, chemical and engineering industries are largely concen-

trated in the British zone. The British economic administration in Germany must aim at their re-activation if it wants to prevent utter ruin and mass starvation. But British industry, with its pressing need for exports, is bound to watch the re-activation of German industry with suspicion. It is therefore dangerous on grounds of principle that some leading posts on the Control Commission should be held by persons closely associated with parallel British industries though this is no reflection on their personal integrity.

There can be no doubt that, of the two risks, that of killing the British zone is on all scores the greater one, politically, morally and in terms of cost to the British taxpayer. This dilemma makes it particularly urgent for Britain to make efforts in preventing at least the economic disintegration of Germany. A great proportion of western German production, instead of being forced on the world market in competition to British products, could then be used for internal German needs. The different parts can never be healthy economic units by themselves and the British zone in particular must needs be either a perpetual burden on Britain, or a competitor on the world market.

(3) *The Social Issue.* The different social and political philosophies of the Allies clash in Germany. The Russians have formed some of the industries in their zone into a Soviet *Aktiengesellschaft* controlled by the Soviet State. For the rest, they have, partly with the help of sponsored plebiscites, expropriated many German undertakings. They have also dissolved all organizations of industrialists. The course is set on large scale socialization, at least for the major industries. Similarly, the splitting up of the large estates is leading gradually to collective farming on the Russian pattern. At the other end of the scale, the Americans favour private enterprise along with federalism and democracy on the American pattern and these principles sometimes clash. When the parliament of Hesse voted for the socialization of the I.G. Farben assets, the American authorities, who wanted to offer the different plants to private bidders, demanded a special plebiscite. The plebiscite decisively confirmed parliament. The Americans will, however, do everything, within the limits set by their own theories of the people's sovereignty, to retard socialization. Thus, General Clay observed recently that it was not the function of the bizonal economic administration (controlled at present by the Socialist economic ministers) to proceed with the socialization of industry. Britain stands as so often between the great antipodes. For once however, her line should be fairly clear. The biggest concentrations of industry—coal, iron and steel, chemical and engineering industries—are in the British zone; their owners have been largely dispossessed and arrested. The British Government has repeatedly declared its wish that these industries should be transferred to public ownership. There is no alternative other than to create a new empire of German industrialists.\*

\* The reasons for this and the possibilities of public control without undue concentration of economic power were set out in an article in *The Times*. February 13, 1947.



This is one of the matters intimately connected with Allied control policy and security, and it is entirely proper that the British government should lay the foundations for a public control of basic industries, leaving its eventual form to duly constituted German democratic authorities. The result of the *Land* Parliament elections just held in the British zone ensures the support of German public opinion. The Social Democrats, the Communists and a considerable section of the Christian Democrats all support the socialization of basic industries. At present, these industries are under British or Anglo-American trusteeship. It is however a necessary corollary that workers should be trained in industrial responsibility and management. On this there has been deplorably small progress, partly through the obstinacy of Germany industrialists, whose attitude of being "master in their own house" is a dangerous sign of returning self-confidence, partly through the lukewarm attitude of British control authorities themselves. There are many possibilities for such participation, on the boards of public undertakings, in the management of chambers of industry and commerce, etc. Nowhere do workers' organizations need more encouragement and training in responsibility than in Germany.

(4) *Transfer of Responsibility to Germans.* It is now common ground among the Allies that they cannot continue to govern Germany themselves, though they must continue to control her for many years. But the transfer of responsibility to Germans suffers from two major difficulties, some of them of the Allies' own making. The one is the desperate dearth of capable trained personnel, through death, old age, Nazi persecution and continued captivity. De-Nazification has greatly added to it. The latter affects the life of the average German more than any other aspect of Allied occupation. The policy of categorizing the entire population (Control Council Directive No. 24 gives 99 categories of persons excluded from office and positions of responsibility because of their Nazi affiliations) was admirable in theory but it has failed in practice. It was unrealistic to sit in judgment over many millions of minor Nazis, many of them just following the dictates of bread-and-butter rather than to pounce swiftly and mercilessly upon a limited number of major functionaries and industrialists. Much modification has been necessary, first through a complicated review and appeal procedure which has led to a luxurious growth of informing and intrigue, but above all through the need which has arisen in every zone of evading the rules in order to maintain a minimum of efficiency in administration. This has often meant the retention of the senior men and the sackings of the minor fry—another source of bitterness. The tale is far too complicated for this very summary analysis. But there is now no alternative but to go ahead and complete the procedure within a definite time limit. Otherwise the hundreds of thousands who have lost their existence through the de-Nazification procedure would feel lasting bitterness against those who have been saved by an amnesty. Many administrative sim-

plifications would be possible.\*

The policy of excessive federalization has made the transfer of responsibility to Germans more difficult. Hundreds of ministers, with vested interests in particularism, and hundreds of new petty bureaucracies are no help to effective government. Time and again military government must step in. The Allies cannot abandon the right to reserve certain major policy decisions to themselves. But they must use this right more and more sparingly. It would certainly be a mistake to impose a German constitution on Germans from outside, and in the long run, enforced federalization would have a boomerang effect. The local government reform in the British zone, which is alien to German traditions of local government and was imposed from outside, will almost certainly be repealed by the Germans as soon as they are free to do so.

*Re-Education and the German Mind.* Admirable work has been done in the re-opening of schools, universities and the provision of guest lecturers. But re-education is not essentially a matter of institutions. It is above all a question of impressing the German people with the superiority of the moral values rather than of the physical powers of their conquerors. The prospects for this have greatly diminished during the last two years. Only those who were in Germany in the days following the capitulation can appreciate the magnitude of the chance which has now gone. More Germans than was admitted at the time had worked against the régime and longed for the end (though a large proportion of these were killed by the Nazis). Many were stunned by the sheer magnitude of the disaster and the might of the Allies, others by the criminal and nihilistic destructiveness of the Nazi leaders, their callousness towards their own people. Many were ready to replace a child-like faith in their leaders by an equally childlike faith in the mighty democracies. Very many had listened to the B.B.C. and believed its picture of a better world. And all were glad the nightmare of the last twelve months was over.

Admittedly a mixture of motives, and not a very firm foundation for a thorough change of heart. But there was a unique readiness to start again under the guidance of the Allies. If to-day the picture is very different, if the German people are bitter, cynical, weary and without hope, it is certainly not all the fault of the Allies. Many hundreds of Military Government officers have won the lasting respect and admiration of the Germans, and the failure of the great objectives should not obscure such achievements as the restoration of transport, or the execution of the agricultural programme of 1945, in the face of unbelievable difficulties.

On the other hand, the conversion of large numbers of Germans was hardly skin deep. Two of their gravest faults are again very much in evidence: race arrogance (especially towards the Poles, the word *Polengesindel* is still very

\* Most Germans in responsible positions have answered the famous "*Fragebogen*" six times or more. Respect for this method decreases with needless repetition.



current) and power worship. There are still many who desperately believe in democratic values, despite the many blows dealt to their faith. The first blow was the calamitous thesis of the collective and equal guilt of all Germans (as distinct from the obvious principle of collective responsibility) for the consequences of the war. Ever since there has been more material for the encouragement of cynics than of believers. Those Military Government officers who broke through the sterile isolation of headquarters know well enough the difficulties: of fighting the *Herrenvolk* mentality when the Western Allies (as distinct from the Russians) still carefully maintain an entirely separate style of living, of travelling, of entertainment, etc.; of fighting the power ideology when every German sees daily the power conflicts of the Allies; of condemning Nazi slave labour and race policy when millions of soldiers are still kept in captivity and millions have been expelled from their homes; of believing in "decartelization" when the Allies show no sign of applying their principles at home; of believing in the rule of law when house requisitioning (now largely stopped in the British and U.S. zones) is indiscriminate and large numbers of persons have been detained for years without trial; of having faith in the justice of de-Nazification which hits thousands of small men when the Allies compete for the services of prominent Nazi scientists and technicians.

The answer to most of the questions discussed in these articles lies in the realm of high inter-Allied policy. But a few things can be done by Britain on her own.\* The reduction and reorganization of the Central Commission staff should have three main objects: first, to reduce the incredible complexity of the dual machinery of administration and of a control instrument too big for control but too weak for government; and secondly, to mitigate the danger of a sudden abandonment of all effective control, by a weary Parliament, through concentration on key controls; thirdly, and perhaps most important of all, to keep in Germany the considerable numbers of those who have a sense of mission but are frustrated by the machinery and the vast numbers of indifferents. Example means much more than doctrine. Only the best are good enough for the administration of Germany and they ought to be given a status and security corresponding to the importance of their task. No less vital is the breaking down of the isolation of Germans. It is time that Allied personnel should mix more freely with the life of the ordinary people, and that Germans—other than selected lecturers—should have contact with the outer world. The admirable experiment of the Prisoners' University at Wilton Park, if maintained, could gradually provide a nucleus of democratic German leaders, if the trainees are afterwards used in Germany in positions corresponding to their training. Above all, Germans need a ray of hope as well as a sense of firm and purposeful guidance. Germans must again become Europeans.

\* Reference should be made to the admirable Second Report from the Select Committee on Estimates and Expenditure in Germany written in the summer of 1946. Most of its conclusions are still valid.

## CZECHOSLOVAKIA'S RECOVERY

BY EWAN WALLIS-JONES

**T**O-DAY intense and purposeful activity is manifest in Czechoslovakia; everyone looks and *is* busy. Life is already proceeding smoothly. There is enough of the essentials of living for all, and once again many of the luxuries and graces which make living pleasant. The people are happy and once more vital; the majority are better off than in any formerly occupied country with the possible exception of Belgium. They know where they are going, and that they are going in the right direction. For they have a plan for the next two years which they all believe in and are determined shall succeed—the Two Year Economic Plan of the Gottwald Government. The Czechoslovaks are moving on to better times with self-confidence and such national pride as their natural modesty permits.

In Prague, art, music and literature thrive again. Goods in the shop windows reflect the popular demand for high standards of beauty in everyday life. There are magnificent performances of the classics of opera, particularly of Dvorak, Smetana and Puccini. The prima donnas both look and sound good—and the best seat in the house costs five shillings or less. The many fine orchestras and ensembles are notable for the excellence and youth of their members. There are packed houses for Shakespeare as well as for Slavonic drama, and as in opera, the productions are modern artistic creations. The best films of the world (British films now taking first place among those imported) are being shown. In the book shops you will find the classics of English, French and Russian literature as well as a lavish stock of Czech and Slovak works. A dozen exhibitions of the most important paintings are there to be visited; the native artists flourish and you see their works in shops and homes as well as museums. In these fields, Prague to-day is unique—the most lively centre of all that is best in Western culture.

Eight years have passed since Hitler on the eve of Munich ended his fanatical broadcast attack on the Czechoslovak Republic and its President with the words: "Here I stand, and there stands he. Decision must be made between us." He thought he was summing up the conclusion of a fight between two irreconcilable words. The main obstacle to the Teutonic enslavement of Europe was about to be removed by a painless operation. Seven years later, President Benes gave his answer in the Prague Parliament. After the years of ruthless occupation and tutelage the Czechs and Slovaks had once more resumed control of their destinies.

The liberation in 1945 (as everywhere else) was also a social and political



revolution. By one and the same act the German and Hungarian oppressors and their Czechoslovak collaborators were removed, with confiscation of their ill-gotten gains and expulsion or political liquidation for both.

When the first Republic was born in 1918 it took over much of the administration and way of life of the shattered Austro-Hungarian Empire. This time the slate was wiped clean. The two big parties which before Munich obstructed the progressive development of the State—the Czech Agrarians and the Slovak Populists—had done enough in wartime collaboration with the enemy to put themselves out of business when their foreign friends departed. Naturally, there were to be no more Fascist, German or Hungarian parties.

The tasks of the Provisional Government which President Benes led into the liberated country on the heels of the Russian Army—first to Kosice, then to Bratislava, then Brno and eventually Prague—were to take over and secure the State territory, recreate an administration and renew the ravaged economic and cultural life of the country.

This, and much more, was done in 1946. Czechoslovakia is in many ways a new country. It is a Slav State. No longer is one third of its people a minority population of Germans, Hungarians, Ruthenians and Jews. It is a national state of Czechs and Slovaks, roughly in the ratio of two to one. It is a smaller country of about twelve millions as compared with the pre-Munich 14.7 millions. Also although about half of the natives of Ruthenia have opted to remain in the new Republic, their territories have gone to Russia and they are resettled elsewhere. All but some 60,000 German workers have already gone, and the Hungarian minority is being exchanged for the Slovaks in Hungary. Those of non-Slavonic descent who remain do so only on the basis of loyalty to the Slav State, and will in time be assimilated. To all Czechoslovaks this was the only possible solution after their pre-Munich experiences. Its achievement has provided the conditions necessary for a stable political order more free and democratic than was even politic before.

In this sense there is a clean break with the past. But to the tasks of building their new State the Czechs and Slovaks have brought political maturity as well as national enthusiasm and vigour. They believe in democracy in a socialized State, what President Benes called "a new democracy politically free and humanitarian." Such is their basic unity of purpose that they may well be best able to achieve it.

Though still frankly—and boldly—experimenting with new political institutions the orderly reconstruction of the country's economic and social life has proceeded smoothly and rapidly. The new institutions are being built as they go along, in a way which corresponds to both old traditions and modern requirements.

It is significant that Dr. Benes—the "President Builder" as he is now called, is still by unanimous choice the Head of State, and that the Provisional Government of Dr. Fierlinger which he brought from abroad to Prague was, in Octo-

ber 1945, confirmed without change by the Provisional National Assembly elected within the liberated country. Their Kosice programme, formulated by the united forces of political leaders exiled in Britain and in Russia, was the basis of a Coalition Government of all parties imbued with the common overriding purpose of rebuilding the country.

If the necessity of eliminating Nazi collaborators is accepted there is in Europe to-day no more strictly democratic country. The elections of May 1946 were both free and fair, and the eight parties contesting (four Czech and four Slovak) are now represented throughout the administration from top to bottom in exact proportion to their support among the people as then evidenced.

The same true reflection of the results of the polls is to be found not only in the present Gottwald Government but also in all the lower strata of the entirely new system of Local Government which has been created. This was built up on the small local "National Committees" and has legislative and executive as well as supervisory power. The original Committees were called into being as a revolutionary act during the occupation for the purpose of taking over the administration and preserving the country from the occupying forces when they were expelled. Above these local National Committees have been created District and Provincial Committees. As in the Constituent National Assembly elected in May 1946 the rough approximation to the popular will which was at first provisionally affected by nomination from above has now been superseded by exact proportional representation on party lines as justified by the elections.

These new organs of local government show some Swiss and British influence. They represent a reaction from the centralized democracy of the First Republic, itself a survival from the Habsburg era of District Executive Offices and Provincial Governors—also from the more recent horrors of the Nazi *führer prinzip*. The occupation taught the Czechs the dangers of bureaucracy despite their aptitude for it. The German passion for red tape raised the ratio of clerical to productive workers from one in eight to one in four. Now local popular control and part-time public service have largely superseded the professional officials.

The first year of liberation was a period of first-aid and basic re-organization in the economy of the country. The main units of heavy industry, mining, food, forestry, banking and insurance were nationalized under the all-party Kosice programme. The most indisputable of many cogent reasons for this course was that by no other means could they be put on their feet again. For during the occupation all important trusts and combines had by various devices including expropriation, been brought under the control of the Germans or collaborators, themselves now due for expropriation. The method followed, of making these concerns "national enterprises", has the advantages of our system of Public Corporations without introducing the deadening effect of a remote and unresponsive bureaucracy; these enterprises were designed to ensure



dynamic and democratic local control adapted nevertheless to an over-all plan, to avoid red tape and to encourage initiative and healthy competition. Each has to show a profit, or explain the reason why it cannot.

The Nazi legacy of inflation was disposed of by an incisive reduction of currency and blocking of accounts. Of 121 milliards of crowns only forty milliards remain in current circulation. But with an unbalanced industry (geared for six years to the German war machines), disrupted communications, depletion of rolling stock and river shipping, and an exhausted soil, it was largely due to the wise use of UNRRA supplies that the country got through the difficult period of transition. Czechoslovakia faced its coal and transport crisis in the winter 1945-46.

Now in the two year plan the economic and moral forces of the country are being marshalled to achieve the levels of pre-Munich times and in many respects improve on them. The plan covers all branches of industry, agriculture, building, transport, investment, labour mobilization, foreign trade and technical and scientific research. In the forefront of the programme is the drive for exports and the gradual raising of the standard of life throughout the country with particular stress on the rapid industrialization of Slovakia. Sixty thousand million crowns (fifteen per cent. of the national income) is being invested in building new houses, roads, railways, bridges, dams and hydro-electric power stations, and in re-equipping industry. Of this investment rather more than one-third will be in Slovakia.

The details of this enormous plan were worked out by an ingenious machine in which the country's experts from all parties played their parts. A group of planning bodies under the Economic Council of the Government was created to reflect at all levels the political trends of the country. The plan that emerged was largely sponsored by the Socialist and Communist Parties (who are the majority group) but *all* the political parties are unreservedly committed to its successful operation, as are also the trade unions, the banks and Government departments. All had their chances of modifying the plan and all retain the possibility of modifying its operation through the appropriate organization.

The large volume of constructive committee work by representative experts working behind closed doors gives a superficial impression that the many technical questions of how much, when and where were decided almost without discussion. The reverse is the case. There was prolonged discussion, but by informed and responsible people chosen by the public to get on with the job.

Thus by January 1, 1947, every productive unit in the country had its target, for this year and next. What is perhaps more important, all managers and workers knew it was a target that could be achieved, and were determined that it would be. It was *their* two year plan, and they would see it through, "Even if it took 100 years", as some said.

The plan is based on realities—the actual possibilities of the country. It does not depend for success on large foreign loans, though they would speed

and ease its course. But it does require a healthy expansion of trade and peaceful co-operation particularly with the West. The country must import raw materials and pay with finished products. Much can be produced from native sources—the "white gold" (sugar from beet), household furniture, and magnificent lace and glassware. But over sixty per cent. of last year's exports were finished goods and most of the productive capacity depends on imports, especially raw material like cotton, wool, iron and hides. These are the present difficulties, and to no other Central European country does talk of an "iron curtain" excluding friendship and trade with Britain, the United States and France sound so unfortunate and such nonsense. If there be a barrier, it is not of their making.

The Czechoslovak import-export trade in fact did well in 1946. There was a rapid and steady expansion, and in money value 1937 levels were surpassed. But allowing for the higher prices of to-day its *real* volume is only half of what it was in 1937. A slight check in November was most marked in the raw cotton imports (and consequently the export of finished cotton goods)—an industry whose main source of supply has been Russia. The similarity of our own export problems, and possibly other significant trends, are indicated by the fact that in the same month Britain became the leading importing country after lying fifth during the previous year, whereas Russia after being the chief supplier dropped to sixth place. But Czechoslovakia will not soon forget the large first-aid supplies of raw materials (particularly cotton) which Russia provided in the early days of liberation and which made the restarting of industry then possible.

As in Britain there is an acute manpower shortage. Somewhere half a million extra workers or their equivalent must be found. The methods followed are instructive. Clerical staffs are rationed, and 160,000 civil servants are to be put to productive work. (What about our two million?) Banking, insurance and business are to disgorge another 25,000. The rapid decontrol of goods and the elimination of unnecessary links in their distribution will not only release more workers, but also lower prices. A hundred thousand extra workers are to be acquired from other countries. Czechs and Slovaks are returning home, especially from Hungary. Bulgarian and Italian workers are being brought in too. The mobilization of 100,000 women for industry is in train. The trade union movement is the active partner of the Government in a drive to increase productivity by rationalization and modern methods. It also supports a forty-eight hours (eight hour day) week, and payment by results.

Wages by piece rates or "norms" agreed with the trade unions are fixed by the Government, and there are no strikes. For a State Price Fixing Authority also controls the price of everything. At the end of 1945, prices and the cost of living were stabilized at about three times, and the wages of productive labour at about four times, their 1939 levels. Since then prices and the cost of living have not altered much, and wages not at all. The workers recognize that it is



etter for them that prices should come down, as the Government intends, than that they should demand more wages by sectional pressure on the country's economy. Compulsory direction of labour may be necessary, but so far the alternative of providing effective inducements to good work is being tried. The wages of productive labour are attractive compared with those of the black-coated workers. Overtime is well paid, and taxed less. Competitions between factories are encouraged, State gifts (wireless sets, extra clothes, holidays) are given for notable achievements.

On the other hand, the career of the unproductive worker and the shirker is unenviable in pay or popular prestige. For everyone must work, and the public spirited citizen-worker has his chance—through works council and factory committee (recognized and prescribed by law) and trade union as well as in the wider network of national committees—of removing inefficiency and castigating the shirker and the parasite.

The benefits of the plan to the worker—with its promise of better living and the present concrete benefits of an extensive social welfare service (under the Ministry for the Protection of Labour and Social Welfare) as well as a stable and reasonable ratio between wages and prices—have made him the main guarantee of its success. In the industrial field as in the political *responsibility* rests with *power*. The result is a heightened social conscience and self-confidence, a spirit of joint adventure and not of frustration. Can this be said of any other post-war country?

At the re-opening of the Prague Parliament on November 9, 1945, Dr. Fierlinger, then Prime Minister, spoke prophetic words about "the rôle of our workmen and employees in our new planned economy." "They must realize that by increasing working efficiency and discipline they are doing themselves the best service. On the results of their work will depend the improvement of their standard of living. The political maturity of our workmen will permit the close association of all employees and managements, and this association will be a guarantee of the success of our new democratic economy. The whole world will closely observe the results, and will judge accordingly as to whether and to what extent similar far reaching economic changes can be brought about peaceably and without social upheavals. We may say that we shall become the pioneers of new ways in economy."

The people of Czechoslovakia are responding. They have aimed for the stars—they are already above the tree tops. Can we not learn something from their methods?

*(On a recent visit, at the invitation of its Government, the author was given exceptional opportunities for studying the reconstruction of Czechoslovakia's economy.)*

## WHY GREECE AND TURKEY?

BY DEREK PATMORE

WHEN President Truman made his recent dramatic speech to Congress many people may have been surprised by the manner in which he bracketed Greece with Turkey. Yet history shows that the fate of both countries is closely interlocked. Even in the days of the great Byzantine Empire, Salonika was a town of immense strategic importance and commanded the main route to the imperial capital of Constantinople. The first world war also showed how dangerous this great Greek port could be to Turkish security when controlled by an enemy for it must not be forgotten that Churchill's bold plan to capture the Dardanelles by using Salonika as a main base of operations nearly succeeded. To-day, modern warfare and the invention of new weapons have made Greece and Turkey even more dependent on each other for their mutual independence and safety, and both Athens and Ankara are well aware of the fact.

The present friendship between Greece and Turkey is all the more remarkable when one remembers the fierce enmity that existed between the two countries for over a hundred years. This hatred began with the Greek War of Independence when the Greeks rose against the Turkish Empire. It persisted through the First World War and culminated in the ill-fated Greek campaign in Anatolia following the defeat of the Turks and the occupation of Constantinople, or Istanbul as it is now known, by the victorious Allied Powers. However, both the Turks and Greeks are realists and soon after the rise of Kemal Ataturk and the foundation of the present Turkish Republic in 1923, both nations decided that the time had come to forget a centuries' old feud and renew the traditional friendship between the two races—for many Greeks rose to power and ruled the Ottoman Empire. Negotiations were started by Kemal Ataturk and Ismet Ineunu on the Turkish side and by the great Greek Leader, Eleutherios Venizelos on the Greek, to settle all outstanding difficulties and make a convention between the two countries. Both Greece and Turkey were fortunate to have such far-seeing leaders at the time and Europe was astonished to witness the spectacle of two bitter ex-belligerents settle all their quarrels in a peaceful manner.

The desire of both Kemal Ataturk and Venizelos to bury the past and become friends was also actuated by the knowledge that the first world war had shown that the defence of the Dardanelles was only possible when Salonika and the Aegean Islands were in friendly hands and because the Greek Premier realized



that Greece had little hope of survival unless she had a friendly Turkey by her side. So the Greeks and Turks settled their difficulties by one of the greatest transfers of populations known in modern times, and later when the Balkan Entente was formed it found both Greece and Turkey pledged to come to each other's defence in the case of aggression.

In weighing the importance of President Truman's momentous speech on the future of American policy, it is wise to bear the above facts in mind. For in asking for American help and supplies to these two nations, Truman and his political advisers are only advising a logical and sane foreign policy for the American people. American statesmen like Mr. Henry Wallace may think otherwise but an examination of the present situation in both Greece and Turkey will confirm that the majority of the populations in both countries have welcomed President Truman's dramatic statement as their only hope of survival.

For two thousand years, the Greek people have been haunted by fears of invasion from their northern frontier. The Slav has always been the traditional enemy of the Greek. Throughout the centuries, Bulgaria has been the chief enemy. Even in the days of the Greek Byzantine Empire, the warlike Bulgarians were perpetually threatening Greek or Byzantine independence. The short-lived Bulgarian Empire was a dire menace but it soon collapsed and the famous Byzantine Emperor Basil II, called by his subjects *Bulgaroctone* or "Killer of the Bulgarians" annihilated Bulgaria as a country. But, like all conquerors he could not exterminate the whole Bulgarian people and centuries later they arose to threaten the Greeks once again. In the present century, neighbouring Bulgaria has invaded and attacked Greece three times. Yet to-day, Bulgaria is now protected by the powerful Soviet Union and held up to the world as a democratic country by extreme Left enthusiasts throughout the world whilst Moscow daily condemns the present Greek Government as fascist and undemocratic.

At the end of the recent world conflict, Greece was quite willing to make a sincere attempt to settle her differences with Bulgaria provided this country would make reparations for damage done in Greek territory. Bulgaria, too, at first seemed inclined to make a definite effort to make amends to Greece. I was in Sofia just after the liberation of the country by the Red Army in 1944, and the Bulgarian Premier, Kimon Georgieff, was loud in his protestations that Bulgaria would now be a model democratic state and that his country would make just amends to Greece. A year later, the entire Bulgarian attitude had changed. Now secure in Soviet Russian support, the same Bulgarian Premier was openly attacking the Greek Government and cries were heard in Sofia that Bulgaria must have the Aegean outlet to the sea and use of Salonika. Why had the Bulgarian attitude changed? The answer is the result of the Greek Revolt which had occurred in December 1944 and ended in the beginning of 1945.

Students of Balkan affairs are just starting to realize that the Greek Revolt

was a turning point in the affairs of the Balkan peninsula. For had the Greek Communists, who controlled the E.A.M. coalition, gained power and driven the British from Greece then the whole of the Balkans would have fallen under Soviet Russian influence. The Greek people were well aware of the tremendous issues at stake but unfortunately world-wide political propaganda from both the Greek Left and Right Parties has obscured the underlying significance of this tragic event.

The Greek Revolt was a fight for power by a highly organized, ruthless minority. Under the façade of the Greek Resistance Movement, known as E.A.M., the Greek Communist Party had achieved the inner direction of the Left Coalition long before the December troubles. This is an important fact as apologists for the Greek Communists and E.A.M. in general are inclined to maintain that it was British Imperialism that provoked the struggle and that E.A.M. were only fighting for their independence and democratic rights. But documents and books are beginning to be published, such as Denys Hamson's *We Fell Among Greeks*, which prove that the Greek Communists were beginning to seize power during the German Occupation as far back as 1943-1944. Moreover, it is known that many British Intelligence reports from British liaison officers in Greece who were fighting beside the Greeks had warned G.H.Q. Middle East that trouble was coming. True to their democratic principles, the British Cabinet under Winston Churchill made repeated attempts to reconcile the growing cleavage between the Greek Communist Movement known as K.K.E. and the other Resistance Parties opposing the Germans and Italians in occupied Greece. At a series of conferences, the British Government and its envoys made earnest attempts to persuade the Greeks to bury their political differences, and at Caserta, just before the Liberation of Greece by British troops, an agreement was signed by General Serafis, Commander-in-Chief of E.L.A.S. (the military body of E.A.M.) and General Zervas, the chief of the opposing Greek Resistance party E.D.E.S. and Field-Marshal Sir Henry Maitland-Wilson by which all the Greek leaders agreed to serve under a British commander in Greece when the country was freed.

The December Revolt occurred because E.A.M. refused to fulfil the Caserta Agreement and carry out the orders given to them by General Sir Ronald Scobie. Indeed, as one of the press correspondents who experienced the Greek Revolt, I am convinced that the E.A.M. leaders were determined to sabotage the Coalition Government formed under M. Papandreou when Greece was liberated and that the extremists in E.A.M. were bent on an armed revolt against the British and the existing Greek Government. In this, the Greek Communists were only following the example set in neighbouring Balkan countries. It is true that Moscow maintained an outwardly neutral attitude during the Greek Revolt but it is significant that the Soviet Russians have openly championed E.A.M. and its leaders ever since their defeat.

The violence and horrors of the Greek Revolt opened the eyes of the Greek



people to the dangers that threatened them and one of the reasons why E.A.M. failed is that this Left Coalition unwisely advocated friendship and alliance with Bulgaria and Yugoslavia both of whom were now openly encouraging a free, autonomous Macedonia with Salonika as its capital—thereby threatening Greek territorial independence. Immediately, the Greek peasant saw the centuries' old menace of the Slavs coming down from the north revived, and he rallied to what he considered the only alternative—the monarchy.

I have dealt at some length with the Greek Revolt as it still casts its shadow across contemporary Greek politics. Like the Spanish Civil War, it left a heritage of bitterness and hate and it is the main reason why no real coalition government formed from all the parties has been possible. Moreover, as the Greek is a fierce individualist by nature he tends towards extremes. The British dreams of a moderate centre party in power became an impossibility when faced with the fierce hatreds existing between the Right and extreme Left political parties. Finally, the fact that the future of Greece has now become an international issue has encouraged the various political parties inside Greece to support and play off one great Power against the other.

How then is President Truman's intervention in Greek political affairs beneficial to the Greek people? The answer is that the majority of the Greeks do not want Communism. During the last year, they have proved this twice. First, when the Greek General Elections were held under Allied supervision and secondly when the plebiscite on the King's return was held last September. Foreign sympathizers of the Greek Left parties are inclined to believe that the Greeks did not support E.A.M. because they were coerced and bullied into voting for the Centre and Right parties. Any foreign resident in Greece knows that this is not the truth. The majority of the Greeks voted for the present Government and the return of King George II of the Hellenes because they saw that it was the only alternative to a Communist-controlled Government which would surrender the country to Soviet Russian influence and institute régimes similar to those now existing in neighbouring Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, and in Rumania. Despite the failings of the present Greek Government, it is a free popularly elected government and it does represent the will of the majority of the Greeks. Freedom of speech and freedom of the press still exist in Greece and this cannot be said of any other Balkan country to-day.

Apart from political differences inside Greece, the main problem facing the Greek nation is economics, and it is here that the United States can play a leading rôle in organizing and restoring the country's shattered national economy. Already UNRRA, under the able leadership of an American, Buell M. Maben, has done miracles. The scourge of malaria has been almost wiped out; Greek agriculture is on the road to recovery, and UNRRA has done a great deal to raise the level of public health. It has long been the belief of competent British and American observers in Greece that if the national economy of the country can be restored then the threat of communism will vanish. Only the

United States has the funds to help Greece's economic recovery and this is why the Greeks as a whole have welcomed President Truman's demand for aid to Greece. Recently Communist propaganda in Greece has been trying to stir up discord between Greece and Turkey. The E.A.M. leaders in public speeches throughout the country made repeated demands for the return of Eastern Thrace to Greece although it is part of Turkish territory. The extreme Left press in Athens has also been active in trying to discredit the Turks in the eyes of the Greek people. "Turkey did not fight in the war", "Turkey is a re-actionary power", etc. Indeed, the Turkish Ambassador to Greece, M. Ruchef Esren Unaydin, told me last year: "Our only enemy in Greece is E.A.M." Fortunately, this Communist attempt to divide the two countries has not succeeded. During the last year, there have been many exchanges of goodwill between the two nations and there is a growing trade between Greece and Turkey. Moreover, the Greek people, weakened by the recent struggle, regard the neighbouring Turkish Army as a barrier against possible aggression from the north.

Turkey, ever sensitive to the internal affairs of her neighbours, greeted the Greek General Elections and the result of the plebiscite with relief. Although the political situation inside Turkey is in direct contrast to that existing in Greece the Turkish Government has long appreciated the fact that an E.A.M. government in Athens would mean the end of the Greek-Turkish friendships, built up with such care by Kemal Ataturk and Venizelos.

Unlike the Greeks, the Turkish people are disciplined by nature and by tradition. Despite all the support of Moscow, Communism has found little support in Turkey for here Soviet Russian agents had to fight the results of one of the greatest social revolutions of modern times. Like the Soviet Union, the Turkish Republic was born out of the disintegration of a great empire. When the great Turkish patriot, Kemal Ataturk, founded his new republic in 1923, he and his collaborators set to work to remove all the social injustices and bad organization which had brought about the downfall and defeat of the Ottoman Empire. The Kemalist régime introduced as sweeping reforms as those made by Lenin in Soviet Russia. The power of the Moslem religious leaders was broken, Turkish women were freed and made the equal of men, all Turkey's main industries were nationalized and the great estates broken up and distributed amongst the peasants. Kemal Ataturk always maintained that his revolution had been made so that modern Turkey should belong to the Turkish people. In founding his new political party he called it the People's Party for he declared that it must represent the will and desire of the entire Turkish nation. Sweeping the whole Turkish nation along with him, he raised the cry: "Turkey for the Turks" and he made every Turk feel that he had a stake in his country's future.

At the same time, Ataturk pursued a wise and prudent foreign policy. Today, it is ironic to recall that his first foreign alliance was made with the neighbouring Soviet Union. A pact of friendship was signed between Kemal



Ataturk and Lenin by which all outstanding differences between the two countries were declared settled. An article of this pact agreed that the districts of Kars and Ardahan should remain part of Turkey and yet last year these two districts were claimed by Moscow as part of the price for the renewal of this very treaty! At the same time, the Turkish leader decreed that Turkish foreign policy must aim at friendship with all Turkey's neighbours, and that once the Dardanelles question was settled by the Montreux Convention the modern Turkish Republic should have no territorial ambitions. Ataturk also saw that friendship with Great Britain was vital if the new republic was to survive and he laid the foundations of the present Anglo-Turkish Alliance. This foreign policy has been continued by Ataturk's successor, President Ismet Inönü, and still remains the basis of the whole direction of Turkish Foreign Policy. Indeed, Turkey has every desire to remain on friendly terms with her great Soviet Russian neighbour and during the autumn of 1939, the Turkish Foreign Minister, Shukru Saradjoglou, visited Moscow and signed the Turkish-Russian Non-Aggression Pact which was in force throughout the whole war.

However, although Turkey remained neutral in the recent world conflict, it was costly neutrality. This is one of the reasons why the country needs American help. The Turks maintain that it was the continued mobilization of their army throughout the war that stopped Hitler from attacking them and driving down towards the Middle East. In 1939, the Turkish Government mobilized the Turkish forces—over one million men and they have been kept so ever since. When one considers that the country only has a total population of eighteen million, it can be realized what a drain on the national economy so great a mobilization of the man-power has been—indeed, the cost of the army takes half the yearly national budget.

To-day, the Turkish Government would like to demobilize its army as the country is still mainly agricultural and needs workers badly but the recent threatening attitude of Moscow and the troubled state of the Balkans and the Middle East have made such a decision impossible. Apart from the heavy burden of maintaining a great army, Turkey has also felt the consequences of the present world-wide economic difficulties.

Since the war, Turkey has re-orientated her whole foreign trade. To-day, she sells about half her yearly exports to Great Britain and the United States and the recent fuel crisis in this country has already had its repercussions in Turkish commercial circles. Faced with the crisis in British affairs, Turkey needs American financial help if she is to balance her already over-burdened national budget. Also, the Turkish Government need machinery and materials which can only be obtained from the United States at the present time. This applies also to the Turkish State Railways which need re-equipping and improving if they are going to prove efficient in case of defence. At the moment, the main Turkish lines running to the frontiers are extremely vulnerable and need new engines and rails if they are to be used by a large modern army.

Another reason why Turkey needs American help is that the war checked the progress of the Kemalist Revolution. As with the Five Year Plan in neighbouring Soviet Russia, the great social reforms initiated by Kemal Ataturk are not all finished. Most of Turkey's main industries are already nationalized but much still remains to be done. For example, Turkey is at present short of coal despite the fact that the great coal-mines at Zonguldak are amongst the richest in this part of the world. But in order to make these coal-mines produce the maximum of coal, Turkey requires new machinery and equipment which can only be obtained from the United States. One of Turkey's main exports is tobacco and here again America is the chief buyer.

Economics apart, there remains the question of Turkey's political situation. President Truman in his speech to Congress emphasized that Turkish independence and democracy was in danger. Can one regard modern Turkey as a democracy? Soviet Russia says "No" but an examination of the internal situation in the country will show that despite many handicaps democracy is growing in this country which was once known as one of the most traditional and feudal in the whole of Eastern Europe. When Kemal Ataturk founded his republic he realized that it would take time to teach the Turkish people the meaning of real democracy and so instituted only one political party, although he let it be known that a real opposition was desirable in any true democratic state. Even during his lifetime, he experimented with an opposition party but it was a failure. However, his collaborator and successor, President Ismet Inönü, has fulfilled his wishes and last year, the Turkish Republic experienced its first free elections with a genuine opposition party which now has seats in the Turkish National Assembly.

Judged by Anglo-Saxon standards, Turkish democracy may still have many weaknesses but there is no doubt that the Turkish Republic is easily the most progressive and modern state in the Middle East and should with encouragement emerge as a good example of how democratic government can be adapted to an Eastern people. Turkish youth has been trained in Anglo-Saxon methods of government, science, and education. Each year hundreds of Turkish students are sent to study in either Great Britain or the United States and many of these young men have already shown outstanding ability. Modern Turkey turns westwards and not towards the East. This is another reason why President Truman's insistence on the need to help the Turkish people has been received with gratitude throughout Turkey.

A year ago, the Turks were seriously alarmed by the growing menaces of Moscow. A fiercely proud and nationalistic people, they were ready to die fighting for their independence and freedom but being realists they knew that they had little hope of survival if Turkey was attacked by the Soviet Union. Moreover, the prospect looked menacing. On their northern frontier, Bulgaria, always a hereditary enemy was well-armed and under the protection of the Soviet Union. Persia, another neighbour, seemed weak and ready to bow



before the might of the Red Army. In Syria, Communist agents were agitating the Armenians and the Syrians against the Turkish Republic. More dangerous still, reports reached Ankara that the Kurds along their south-eastern frontiers were being organized to revolt and that Moscow sponsored the idea of a Kurdish Republic allied to the Soviet Union. Only Greece remained an ally and friendly neighbour. It looked as if Moscow was deliberately trying to beat Turkey into submission by the subtle method of encirclement.

To-day, the open support of the United States has given Turkey new hope. Despite the insinuations of Soviet Russian propaganda that America only wants to help Turkey for commercial reasons and to impose American imperialism over the country, the average Turk believes that both Britain and the United States are the only two countries that can help Turkey to complete her great scheme of nationalization and the fulfilment of Kemal Ataturk's dream of an ideal Turkish Republic. Confident in their own strength and unity, Turkey to-day remains a point of stability in a dangerous, unstable Middle Eastern world and it is significant that several neighbouring Arab states have found it worth while to sign pacts of friendship with Turkey. Irak signed such a pact last year and recently King Abdullah of Transjordan, one of the shrewdest of the Arab leaders, journeyed specially to Ankara to sign a similar pact.

Finally, Turkey still remains the strongest military power in this part of the Mediterranean. Although the Turkish army is mainly infantry, it has been trained by British and American military experts. During the war, both the British and Americans built a number of modern airfields in various parts of the country, and although the Turkish air force is small it is highly trained and modern in equipment. The Turks have always been good soldiers and undoubtedly their present army could give an excellent account of itself.

Opponents of President Truman's policy towards Greece and Turkey declare that it will inevitably lead to war. But neither of these two countries has shown any inclination to attack any of its neighbours. On the contrary, both the Greeks and Turks need peace to consolidate their internal situations. Surely, if two countries desire to model their governments on the Anglo-Saxon pattern of democracy, it is only right that the greatest western democracy—the United States—should offer help in moments of crisis?

*(Until recently the author lived in Greece and Turkey and worked as the Balkan correspondent of a daily newspaper.)*

## THE ANATOMY OF PEACE.

By W. R. INGE

A MANIFESTO which has sold by the hundred thousand in the United States, which has been published in Argentina, Brazil, China, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, France, Germany, Great Britain, Greece, Holland, Hungary, India, Italy, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, and which has been earnestly recommended by many eminent men including Albert Einstein and Thomas Mann, must be either an important contribution to political thought or an eloquent expression of what men of good will are thinking all over the world. Emery Reves's *The Anatomy of Peace*\* fulfils both these conditions.

The thesis may be stated shortly in the author's own words :

The existing system of sovereign nation-States, accepted and upheld to-day by capitalists and socialists, individualists and collectivists, all groups alike, constitutes the insurmountable obstacle to all progress, to all social and economic efforts, that bars all human progress on any lines.

The political framework of our world with its seventy or eighty nation-States is an insurmountable obstacle to free industrial progress, to individual liberty, and to social security.

The argument is summarized in the paragraphs which follow, after which I shall venture on a few doubts and criticisms.

The industrial revolution has brought a social and political change without parallel in human history. Our political and social conceptions are still Ptolemaic; the world in which we live is Copernican.

Capitalism and socialism have both failed. Free enterprise, free trade and free competition were the economic corollary of political liberty. This system, "a most promising departure, was halted, disrupted and strangled" when the United States and Germany decided that free trade was no doubt the right policy for the economically strongest nation, but that they wished to satisfy their own needs, to build up their production, and to have a surplus for export. The result was a system of warring national economies guided by political rather than economic interests. This is trade warfare, under which economic freedom is a farce. Planned economy, however controlled, leads to dictatorship and destruction of liberty. The clash between industrialism and nationalism leads to the domination of the individual by the State. Besides this cause of failure, many champions of liberty failed to recognize that liberty can only be protected by law. Unregulated freedom defeats itself.

The chapter on the failure of socialism is very interesting in its acute diag-

---

\* Allen & Unwin. 7s. 6d. Penguin Books. 1s.



analysis of the Russian revolution. This was not so much a socialist revolution as a national rising in a politically backward country, which has created something very different from socialism. It did not establish either economic equality or social justice. Least of all did it carry out the programme honestly desired by Marx and Lenin, according to which, as soon as class-distinctions were levelled, the State would "wither away." At present in Russia gradations in wealth and power are as pronounced as in any capitalist country; a new *bourgeoisie* has come into being. The Soviet State has developed, not towards democracy, but towards absolute State control. Far too much importance is attached to the ownership of the means of production. Management in any case tends to be impersonal; the salaried manager, not the manufacturer nor the shareholder nor the bureaucrat, directs the business. It is also untrue that a "redistribution" of the national income could produce anything but universal poverty. It is interesting to recall that Lenin in 1917 declared that "we set ourselves the ultimate aim of destroying the State, i.e. every organized and systematic violence." "Where the State exists there is no freedom. When there is freedom there will be no State." Nothing can be more contrary to what has actually happened. The achievements of Soviet Russia, which are considerable, have no more to do with socialism than those of Napoleon's marshals. Revolutions usually bring to the front able and energetic men in the prime of life. Meanwhile, the communist bodies in foreign countries have become merely the instruments of Russia's nationalist policy, which aims solely at strengthening the position of Russia as a nation-State. The author concludes that socialism by itself does not raise the material standard of the workers, nor does it secure for them a higher degree of political and economic freedom. Both capitalism and socialism are now dominated by nationalism, the enemy of progress and happiness.

Under the influence of nationalism, all the nations are travelling along the same road, the road to Fascism and serfdom. In some countries democratic and liberal political principles have been openly repudiated, and a new creed, which proclaims the State as the ultimate goal of human activity, has been advocated. The Marxian theory that communism is the natural result of capitalism has proved to be false. Only in Russia, which had never been a capitalist society, has communism been established by revolution, though about a dozen capitalist societies have become Fascist. The only existing communist country has evolved into a totalitarian Fascist State. Socialism and capitalism now look much like each other. There are many socialist features in capitalist countries, and many capitalist features in the most socialist country. The Fascist movement, opposed alike to socialism, democracy and Christianity, has spread over the globe. When Huey Long was asked whether the United States would become Fascist, he replied: "Surely, but we shall call it anti-Fascism." The Russians call it anti-Fascism, and their self-deluded admirers in other countries believe them.

The Fascist doctrine of the deified State was proclaimed by Mussolini in the *Encyclopedia Italiana*: "Liberalism denied the State in the interest of the individual. Fascism reaffirms the State as the embodiment of the individual. For the Fascist everything is in the State; nothing human or individual exists outside the State; even less, nothing has any value. The State is the creation of right."

The real conflict of our age is between industrialism and nationalism. Within the nation-State the evolution towards Fascism is inevitable. We are moving straight towards Fascism; to a large extent we are there already. Fascism is the inescapable result of the conflict between industrialism and nationalism at their saturation point within the framework of a sovereign nation-State.

Mr. Reves thinks that treaties are always futile, because they are never kept. The only instrument which can preserve peace is law—law which is recognized as superior to the free decisions of any independent State. A fatal weakness of treaties is that they always try to freeze things as they are, and to make changes impossible except through war. But law is 'dynamic'; it can adopt necessary changes. The author quotes a fine utterance of Winston Churchill in 1930, in which after lamenting that "Europe is organized on a purely nationalistic basis," he added, "no one can suppose that this is going to last."

People speak scornfully of the 'super-State.' But the nation-State has become a super-State. We are called upon periodically to sacrifice everything for sheer survival. We are not free when we may be called upon at any moment to kill and be killed, when we have to waste all our resources on the tools of war, when freedom of speech is curtailed by the censorship, and when taxation and inflation destroy all our savings. It is ironical that nation-States were created to safeguard the very liberties of which they have deprived us. Peace is possible only if the relations of States are regulated by a higher sovereign authority embracing all of them. Force without law cannot prevent war.

The fetish of self-determination has multiplied sovereign States, and within twenty years nationalism has devoured all its children. "All the new nations have been conquered and enslaved."

The reader is sure to ask whether there is the slightest chance of existing Governments consenting to a limitation of their powers. Can we, for example, imagine Mr. Molotov refraining from exercising his favourite veto upon any such proposal? The author has no such hope. His object is to prove that unless the nations consent to an agreement of this kind, which he refuses to call a surrender of their liberty, nothing can avert a third world-war, from which civilization would not recover. It is useless, he protests, to call his argument unpractical. A practical man, said Disraeli, is a man who practises the errors of his fathers. We in England have gone to war again and again to preserve the balance of power. The balance of power can maintain peace only as long as power is *not* in the balance. The chief reason why peace was so seldom broken in the nineteenth century was that British naval supremacy was un-

hallenged, and that we had no territorial ambitions, at any rate in Europe. But imperialism generally arises from a desire for security rather than from mere land-hunger. Security however means that our rivals must not be secure; hence the fatal competition in armaments, and the wish to erect a *cordon sanitaire* round our frontiers. We seem to be on the verge of a new epoch of empire-building, of aggregations larger and more powerful than ever before. For the first time in history the conquest of the world by a single power is a possibility. We have to choose between a unification of the world by force, by conquest, or by the acceptance of a super-national law. The happier solution does not seem so impossible when we consider the harmony of such polyglot nations as Switzerland, or the ease with which immigrants from all countries become loyal and peaceable citizens of the United States. The author thinks it would be a misfortune to break up such a polity as the British empire, which has solved some of the problems. The multiplication of small independent nation-States is a step in the wrong direction.

Mr. Reves does not underrate the danger: "The fight for liberty will have to be fought anew from the very beginning. It will be infinitely harder than it was two centuries ago. For we have to destroy tremendously strong, sacrosanct, mechanical institutions. Those who fight for the lost freedom of man will be persecuted by the nation-States more cruelly than were our forefathers by the absolute monarchs." "The institution must be erected before we can demand loyalty to it." But an institution which can give security, peace and happiness will win loyalty—if only it can be given a chance.

The thesis of this book is very much like that of Arnold Toynbee in his *A Study of History*.\* European anarchy must be ended, and it can be ended only in one of two ways—by agreement or by a knock-out blow by the strongest power, that is, by Russia, since Germany has gambled and lost. Toynbee has not made it clear which he considers the more probable. The very strength of nationalism perhaps makes world-conquest almost impossible. Asia and Africa are in revolt against European domination, and we, at any rate, are accepting the new situation. Mr. Reves calls Russia and America the most "virulently imperialistic" of nations. This is patently unfair to the United States, which does not keep Canada and Mexico in trepidation, though the annexation of both would undoubtedly be possible. It remains to be seen whether Russia aims at the domination of two continents. Expansion has been steadily pursued by all Russian Governments since the first Czars, and there is no reason to think that the present rulers are more pacific than the old. But they do not at present want war with any great power, and history seems to show that though Russian armies fight magnificently when they are defending their own soil, they are much less formidable when they are invading other countries. The situation is dangerous, but I do not think it is hopeless. Moreover, the only example of a durable world-empire in history is not encouraging

\* Oxford University Press.



to militarists. The Romans established relative peace and prosperity round the Mediterranean for two hundred years. At the end of that time there were very few Romans left.

In reading almost any American book (Mr. Reves however is now a British subject) we have to remember that on the other side of the Atlantic democracy is a fetish invested incongruously with semi-divine honours, whose name is to be mentioned with reverence. It is bad manners to smile at our neighbours when they are at their devotions, and Mr. Reves has shown by his severe judgment on American foreign policy that he does not think democracies immune from territorial ambition. Such different statesmen as Mirabeau and Salisbury have given emphatic expression to the opposite opinion. But the ballot-box is not a Urim and Thummim for ascertaining the will of God. No Christian can expect to see the largest crowd gathered round the narrow gate. Democracy is only an experiment in government, which is accepted without much enthusiasm by the north-western group of European nations and their offshoots beyond the seas. The assumption in this book that the super-national governments must be democratic would not matter if the author had not said that no nation must be allowed to choose its form of government. This interference would be absolutely fatal to his scheme.

There is one important question which the author has not considered. He says: "Free trade without free migration is an economic absurdity." Does he wish to allow free migration? A Japanese gentleman once called upon me in London and said: "I believe you are a strong supporter of the League of Nations?" "I used to be. I began with faith and went on with hope. Now there is nothing left but charity." "If we disarm and join the League, shall we be allowed to settle in half-empty countries like California and Australia?" "I am afraid you will not." "We shall be kept out by force as we are now?" "Yes." "Then why should we join the League?" The people of those countries are convinced that if Asiatics were allowed free entry, there would soon be no white men left. That is the Yellow Peril as understood by C. H. Pearson and Rudyard Kipling. I can see no reason why under super-national law the nations should not be allowed to close their frontiers. But few nations with a high standard of living have resisted the temptation to import foreigners to do the rough work. The Americans did so until the advocates of the Nordic theory and their own labour leaders induced them to reverse their policy. In France before the war there were three million aliens, most of them manual labourers. Only half the coal miners were Frenchmen. Our working class are strongly opposed to this expedient, though the miners seem now to hate their job. The question of free trade is connected with this problem. In the last century we were not afraid of foreign competition; but when Japanese stockings were offered for sale, in Manchester of all places, at three-pence a pair, the advantages of free trade were not so apparent. Are we to

acquiesce in a universal levelling down of wages to something like the coolie rate? That would not suit us at all. If on the other hand the nations were all allowed to protect their own industries, should we not be still engaged in the economic nationalism which the author rightly regards as a form of war? If violence is prohibited, and trade free, the future would seem to belong to nations where the workmen give the best value for their wages.

Mr. Reves adds a postscript about the atomic bomb. It is possible that this hideous invention may convince the civilized world that war must be the nextomination to go. But I do not think that it will be used in the next war, if unhappily there is another war. It would not give the Germans much satisfaction to destroy London if they knew, as they would, that Berlin would be wiped off the map on the following day. It is not true that barbarous weapons are always used. Homer mentions poisoned arrows, but in classical times they were not used by the Greeks or Romans. Expanding bullets have been banned. Poison gas was not used, by agreement, in the late war. We may only hope that the bomb will not be used against nations which are unable to retaliate. The Italians did use poison gas against the Abyssinians.

This book contains no programme, and the immense difficulties are honestly acknowledged. It is an earnest and eloquent appeal to all men and women of good will to realize the appalling danger in which civilization stands as the result of senseless international rivalry. All that makes life worth living is at stake. I do not agree that the abolition of armaments would be useless. Preparations for war are always competitive, and the army chiefs are always on the look-out for the time to strike. "It is always a mistake to delay when you are ready," says Lucan. "The sight of means to do ill deeds makes ill deeds done." The mass of the people in every country desire only to live in peace and quietness; but when the freedom of their nation is threatened, every other consideration is thrown aside. This kind of patriotism is not ignoble, and unhappily it takes only one to make a quarrel. But Mr. Reves is right. War between the sharers of the same civilization is an atrocious anachronism, and it threatens our very existence. "Sirs, ye are brethren; why do ye wrong one to another?" We would make every sacrifice to preserve our liberty, but among the things which we are sacrificing is liberty itself.

## THE PRESS IN THE PROVINCES

BY NEWSMAN

A free and independent Press, a Press, that is, which is free to say what it chooses, subject only to the restraints of decency and the law of libel, and which at the same time is representative of the full variety of opinion and of interest throughout the country, has come to be an indispensable instrument of popular education and of popular government . . . A free Press, again, has ever been and ever will remain alike the bulwark and the sure sign of public liberty. It is not merely that it is in the modern State the necessary means of political propaganda and political agitation, without which no active and healthy political life can exist at all, but only through it can the individual obtain the effectual expression of his thought and make his due and perhaps essential contribution to the life and energy of the nation.

THESE words form part of a leading article written in April 1928, by C. P. Scott in the fifty-eighth and last year of his editorship of *The Manchester Guardian*. The venerable leader of British journalism was moved by what was going on around him to ask how far the increasing concentration of newspaper ownership in a few hands was likely to weaken or destroy this instrument. Unity, he believed, spelt sameness. The variety, the local colour and the sense of individual responsibility which were the very life of a healthy press must therefore tend to fade and perhaps ultimately to disappear.

Less than twenty years later the Government of the day has acceded to a demand from the House of Commons that a Royal Commission should be set up to inquire into the progress of that aggregation and concentration of power which disturbed the editor of *The Manchester Guardian*. He wrote at the height of the first Lord Rothermere's bid for provincial monopoly. The country was to be covered by a network of evening papers modelled on the London *Evening News*, which already had the largest circulation of any evening paper in Great Britain. The provincial press, Rothermere declared, had become fossilized, and the *Daily Mail* published leading articles and maps to underline the blessing of the new dispensation which he was preparing for it. Scott was by no means the only man who saw danger in the proposed chain-gang, but ironically it was the Berry brothers, for altogether different reasons, who did most to defeat the plan. They had already entered the field as rivals for the dominance of the press outside London. Two years of internecine warfare followed. Papers up and down the country were bought for far more than they were worth, pawns in the magnates' game. Business caution at last reasserted itself, and an armistice was declared; the plunder was divided and agreement reached that there should



no encroachment on each other's territory. The British press had moved some way towards trustification but neither the Rothermere programme, nor the Berry programme, had been carried out in its entirety.

Since then, the situation has not altered substantially, though Lord Kemsley, to whom, when the Berrys themselves broke up in 1937, the provincial newspapers in the combine passed, has since added to his properties, and Sir Harold Harmsworth, a cousin of the second Lord Rothermere, has recently purchased a number of papers in the West of England. Meanwhile other processes have been at work which do not lessen the importance of personality and independence. Taking advantage of the progress of those techniques for appreciating, and affecting, public opinion which have come with a greater knowledge of psychology and its application, the national newspapers have penetrated more deeply into the country, not only from London, but, by means of provincial editions, from Manchester, Glasgow and now Edinburgh, where the *Daily Mail* has started to publish, as well. The syndication of news and editorial features on the American model is on the increase. The newer instruments for influencing public opinion, the cinema and the radio, are dominated, in the case of the first, by standardized products created, in Britain as well as in the United States, by what is virtually a single source, and in the case of the second, by the constitutional necessity of acting merely as purveyor and not as interpreter. All these considerations have made it more urgent than ever before that what the American editor, Bruce Bliven, calls "countervoices" should be maintained and protected.

The nature of London's preeminence in the newspaper business of Great Britain, one which, while it reflects the general centralization of British institutions, is unparelled in any country in the world, may be illustrated, simply, in two ways. First: half the employees and more than half the total gross and net output of the industry are centred within a mile of Ludgate Circus. Second: the total sales of all the provincial morning papers are less than those of either the *Daily Express* or the *Daily Mirror*, and those of all the provincial evening papers are rather less than equal to those of the *Daily Express* and *Daily Mirror* combined. On the other hand, there are 124 morning, evening and Sunday papers published outside London, (and not in Eire or the Channel Islands), and 1,288 weekly papers, including those of Greater London. These are impressive totals but numbers by themselves are not so much an indication of strength as of its diffusion. Many of these papers, both dailies and weeklies, live a precarious existence financially, or have little to commend them editorially. And the figures, of course, include some eighty-five members of large combines.

Nevertheless, the 1939-1945 war improved the position overall of the provincial press. The dailies were less affected by emergency transport conditions. The weeklies, despite the hardship caused by call-ups (one small proprietor-editor acted as his own reporter and proof-reader, and assisted his printing staff of five youths between eighteen and fourteen years to set and make up), not

only kept but increased their goodwill. Their essential service, the publication of local news in full, gained importance as war-workers were moved about the country and troops were drafted overseas. The weekly newspaper became a valued link with home town or district. Moreover, with the setting up of new local authorities, such as the County Wartime Agricultural Executives, the columns of the weekly newspaper became an almost indispensable medium for the recording of Orders and Regulations, and for their interpretation. Again, as scarcities of all kinds arose, the classified advertisements, and especially their "For Sale" and "Wanted" columns, were eagerly studied in most households. "Smalls" often accounted for between thirty and thirty-five per cent. of advertising space during the war years in the smaller provincial papers where about half the contents were devoted to advertisements, and "smalls", of course, are very much the most profitable form of advertising.

Once the habit of taking in a local newspaper is formed, it is not readily broken, indeed, when the period of free sales began in the autumn, some district journals reported forty to fifty per cent. increases. The average rise, over the first few weeks, was over sixteen per cent. for weeklies and seven per cent. for dailies, amounting, in numbers of copies, to an overall increase of more than four million. Generally then the local newspaper has enhanced both its prestige and its revenue as a result of the war; one proof of this is to be found in the avidity with which a competitor, or an outside group interest will bid for these small properties when they come into the market.

The pattern of ownership in the provinces in 1947 is a comparatively simple one. To begin with there are the "combines", with their headquarters in London; Northcliffe Newspapers belonging to Lord Rothermere, which covers three principal areas, in the east around Hull, Grimsby and Lincoln, in the Midlands round Stoke, Derby and Leicester, and in the west round Swansea, Cheltenham, Gloucester and Bristol; the Harmsworth Group, centred in Plymouth and Exeter, and covering virtually all Devon and Cornwall; the Kemsley Group, which spreads from Aberdeen to Cardiff with a concentration in Yorkshire and Northumberland; the Westminster Press, which is particularly strong in the Midlands, round Birmingham and Nottingham, and in the North-East; and Provincial Newspapers, which has an outpost in Edinburgh and another in Northampton, but for the rest is pivoted on Lancashire.

Next there are the "groups", whose properties may be extensive but are on a local and not a national basis. Of these, Thomson-Leng Publications, Dundee, who publish two papers daily, and three weekly, and Southern Newspapers, with evening papers in Bournemouth, Southampton and Weymouth are the most important; more characteristic of the "group" organization, however, are Tillotsons Newspapers, of Bolton, who publish one evening paper and six substantial weeklies, covering a single industrial area, and Northamptonshire Publishing Company, with, again one evening paper and four weeklies covering the industrial part of the county.

Then there is the "series" of newspapers, which is usually an amalgamation of a number of very small properties which may or may not keep their own titles, but whose separate existence is still recognized by a special "slip" page. A typical example of the prosperous "series" is the *Kent Messenger*, which has absorbed seven papers in towns within easy reach of Maidstone, and by publishing different editions for each town, dominates a large part of the county.

Finally, there are the "independents", who own allegiance to no one and are interested neither in buying other people's properties nor in selling their own. Here is to be found the moral and intellectual strength of the British provincial press; here is to be found national and even international reputation, not merely a district one. Here, in Manchester, Birmingham, Liverpool, Leeds, Glasgow, Edinburgh, is the real challenge to the trusts and to London. Here are editors, and managers, to whom a newspaper appears not as a piece of property, but as a public office. And the spirit and the virtue of independence are shared by newspapers in the small towns as well as in the cities, by the *Kidderminster Shuttle* and the *Falmouth Packet*, the *Cambuslang Pilot*, the *Impartial Reporter* of Enniskillen and *Udgorn* of Pwllheli, papers whose very names are a symbol of the richness and virility in British journalism which still defy the "gramophone chains" and the would-be monopolists.

Despite the improvement of communications between London and the country in the last twenty years, and the elaborate system of newspaper trains now in existence, a direct and measurable relationship still exists between this independence and the distance from London at which a paper is produced. Thus in the Home Counties and South-Eastern England only one morning and one evening paper are published, and both in Brighton, which has a remarkably flourishing newspaper life of its own, with six papers published inside the borough. Even the most successful weeklies in and near London, such as the *South London Press*, the *Essex Chronicle* (whose proprietor was once assistant editor of the *Evening Standard*), and the *Kent Messenger* are close imitations, in style and make-up, of the "nationals". For instance, the *Essex Chronicle* reporters sign their stories—still an almost unheard of thing in weekly journalism—and pictures and 'diary' smack of Shoe Lane. On the outer fringe of the Home Counties, and still inside the commuting belt, there are evening papers at Swindon and Oxford, both belonging to the Westminster combine, and both, since Charles Fenby left the *Oxford Mail* for Hulton and *The Leader*, colourless as though their nearness to London had drained the life out of them. Incidentally, there would seem to be opportunity, if supplies of news-print improve, for more evening papers in this area, particularly in the coast resorts which have to exist on early editions of the three London papers.

Further west, noticeably at Southampton, the thrall of London seems less intimidating. The *Southern Daily Echo* is an original and intelligent paper with a leader-writer, Gordon Sewell, who has been quoted and praised by Mr.



Churchill, and an editor, C. F. Carr, who has been the moving spirit behind the recent formation of the Guild of British Newspaper Editors. If the Guild succeeds in reasserting the pre-eminence of the editorial function ("editor and manager should march hand in hand, the first, be it well understood, just an inch or two in advance," said C. P. Scott), it will have performed a most valuable service.

Still further west, one moves into country where London may as well be a thousand as a hundred miles away, and the solemn, massive weekly papers are, if anything more important, with their news of crops and the doings of an almost feudal society than the local dailies. The *Western Daily Press* (Bristol), solid but old-fashioned, has an editor of over seventy. The *Bristol Evening Post* is a pleasant but not very enterprising paper, while its colleague, *The World*, has a news-editor who came from the *Daily Mail* and sets a metropolitan tone. *The Bath Chronicle*, another evening paper, is nicely printed and shares the leisurely, complacent outlook of its city. Of the weeklies the *Western Gazette*, which covers the whole of Somerset from Yeovil, is probably the most formidable. In many ways it has changed little since 1760—the files for that date are shown to the visitor with commendable pride. Another influential paper is the *Bodmin Guardian*, the centre of the *Guardian* series which covers a large part of East Cornwall for Sir Harold Harmsworth. Its editor, Browning Lyne, has a reputation for sound judgment of local affairs. West Cornwall is also a Harmsworth province, divided between *The West Briton* (Truro), and *The Cornishmen* (Penzance), whose editor, at the age of eighty, was still magnificently writing and signing a two-column leading article until recently. But the outstanding personality in the West of England is undoubtedly J. L. Palmer, editor of the *Western Morning News*, which is published in Plymouth. His position in the Harmsworth hierarchy is important enough to assure him considerable independence. Transparently honest and straightforward in his dealings, he is respected throughout Devon and Cornwall, and his views on foreign as well as on home policy are much quoted. In the Duchy, the *Western Morning News* is often the only daily paper taken.

Over the Bristol Channel, in Wales, the intense and often separatist patriotism of the people is reflected in a great number of small weeklies which proudly label themselves "Independent" or "National". Though the only three daily papers which are published in South Wales, the *Western Mail* and the *South Wales Echo* from Cardiff, and the *South Wales Evening Post* from Swansea, are all "combine", the first two Kemsley and the third Rothermere, and though their circulation is large, their political importance is negligible. Most of the Nonconformist denominations have their own newspapers, and it is in these, and in the crudely printed but fiercely written sheets in the Welsh tongue that the national character expresses itself. The Welsh press is a law unto itself. No "trust" will ever conquer those valleys.

The lamp burns rather low in the Midlands and Eastern England, with the

honorably excepted of Birmingham, where the *Post*, though it lacks forceful direction in technical matters, and has changed less than seemed possible when it started to put news on its front page a few months ago, still earns the right to be called a great newspaper, because of its devotion to cultural interests and the independence of its Conservatism in politics. It was a good day, it seems, for Birmingham when Lord Illiffe bought the paper over the heads of a group of local business men, for he has permitted it, and the *Mail*, its stable companion, a freedom of expression which would in all likelihood have been impossible if it had been the property of the manufacturing interests. The other two papers in Birmingham belong to the Westminster Press, and the new editor of *The Gazette*, L. B. Duckworth, a shrewd Yorkshireman, may well turn it into the most distinguished paper in the combine by depending less on the London office, and more on the exertions and enterprise of his own staff. Outside Birmingham there is a fairly vigorous evening newspaper life, partly tied, partly free. It was one of the free papers, and one of the most outstanding in the area, the *Wolverhampton Express and Star*, from which Duckworth went. Its editor, Malcolm Graham, is a good organizer and a strong personality. Nottingham is a freak town for it has four newspapers to serve a quarter of a million population. Two belong to the Westminster Press, and the *Journal*, which used to have Barrie on its staff and Cecil Roberts as editor, still has an occasional literary flavour. The *Guardian* and the *Post* belong to a local printing firm, and are directed towards the business and sporting communities, a curious dichotomy, but one which appears to have financial sanction. In the Eastern Counties the penetration of the nationals is very deep. Both Ipswich and Norwich have independent morning and evening papers which are well-run and have a good editorial tradition. They deserve greater support than they get from the surrounding country. But East Anglia is a forgotten land; its inhabitants are sensitive and touchy about their isolation, and their newspapers seem to reflect the complex, sometimes lapsing into petulance and self-pity.

North of the Trent it is a different story. Here is a population, at any rate in Lancashire, which definitely prefers to read local papers, and even though most of the nationals print in Manchester, their Northern editions are strongly localized. In the palmy days before the war, indeed, they were scarcely recognizable as the same papers as those published in Fleet Street. The *Daily Dispatch*, a Kemsley paper with headquarters in Manchester, has a circulation higher than many of the nationals nevertheless, and support for local papers in Blackburn, Preston and Barrow, even though they do belong to combines, is so strong that their editors are left well alone to get on with the job of making "brass" for their London proprietors. In Liverpool, with its morning and two evening papers, there is no representative of a combine, which is unique for a city of its size. The *Post* has a fine literary heritage, due largely to its late editor, John Macleay, and a first-class Parliamentary correspondence.

It is another of the great independents, even though its circulation falls far short of its evening companion, the *Echo*.

Other prosperous signs of Lancashire's local spirit can be seen in Bolton, in Oldham and particularly in Blackpool, where the Grime family cater for the permanent and floating population with equal facility in the *Evening Gazette*. But the glory of Lancashire is still *The Manchester Guardian*, now under A. P. Wadsworth, which is no less indispensable to the cotton man on its doorstep than to the politician in London, or to internationalists everywhere. Though it has suffered severe and unexpected losses to its staff since C. P. Scott died, and with them has lost some of its force and style, especially in foreign affairs, its voice is still the voice of conscience and conviction, and its London correspondence still a model for all to imitate and none to match.

Across the Pennines, Leeds, Huddersfield and Halifax are now the only centres of home rule for daily papers. The Kemsley influence is as all-pervasive from Newcastle to Sheffield as that of Harmsworth in Devon and Cornwall, and the Kemsley products are of a uniform achromatism. From Leeds, W. L. Andrews, one of the most eminent of contemporary editors, wages a determined battle against uniformity in a rejuvenated *Yorkshire Post*. Though its sense of news values is sometimes curiously naïve and its make-up often muddy and uncouth, the *Post* is essentially a readable paper, with some excellent and original reporters, and Andrews, though he calls himself a Tory, proves in his leading articles that he believes in discussion as a solvent of conflicts, which is fundamentally an article of liberal faith.

Over the border, the situation is very largely a repetition of that in Lancashire. From both Glasgow and Edinburgh the nationals publish Scottish editions which resemble their London prototypes even less than the Manchester editions. In Glasgow, Lord Kemsley has a foothold, but *The Record*, with its forceful line on the need for devolution of Scottish affairs, is not kept so closely in leading strings, and Alistair Dunnett, a writer and humanist with a knowledge of Highland problems and a marked sympathy towards things Gaelic, is the least true to type of Kemsley editors. The pity of Scottish journalism, however, is to be found in *The Glasgow Herald* and *The Scotsman*, both, unlike some of their distinguished contemporaries to the South, thoroughly flourishing commercial properties in themselves and not dependent, therefore, on their evening papers to carry them. Neither has the insistent creative conviction of *The Manchester Guardian* or the warm, inquisitive humanity of *The Yorkshire Post*; Dr. Robieson of *The Herald*, and Murray Watson of *The Scotsman* share a mistrust of mystic enthusiasms and valuations, and reflect the national caution in their leading articles. But *The Glasgow Herald* is a paper of style and an expansiveness refreshing in these streamlined days, while *The Scotsman's* general standard of reporting is high, and the ration of its space devoted to correspondence democratically generous.

Both in Northern England and in Scotland the weekly paper thrives not only



in its local intelligence but for its sermon—the word is deliberately chosen—in national affairs. The writers of these leading articles are no mere rearrangers of unfelt phrases, but have an “honest seriousness” which C. E. Montague recognized as having an immense power over British readers. In many parts of Scotland, the daily newspaper habit, for reasons of isolation or economy, has never become strongly entrenched, and there the weekly paper and the B.B.C. are the opinion-forming agents.

The foregoing sketch of the present condition of the provincial press is necessarily incomplete, but from it certain strengths and certain weaknesses emerge. One of the latter has already been stated; the reliance on the profits made by an evening companion has been, and may well be again, when circumstances return to normal, one of the most serious limitations on its economic independence of some of the great provincial morning papers. For instance, it is possible that if Lord Beaverbrook entered the evening newspaper field in Manchester or Liverpool, the result might be the disappearance of *The Guardian* and the *Post*. Another weakness is an ingrained meanness on the part of provincial proprietors towards their editorial staffs. Most first-rate journalists, not content with an artisan's wage, are compelled to look on provincial experience as a stepping stone to London instead of an end in itself. Thirdly, there is antiquated physical form. Respectability in some cases, still demands apparently, as it did in the 'eighties, when R. D. Blumenfeld first came to London, that the paper shall not only be dull, but look dull. Without emulating the exaggerated techniques of Fleet Street, it should be possible for even the smallest country paper to be published in a contemporary manner.

The war, as has been seen, gave the provincial press an opportunity, which remains open at the moment, of preserving the independence which it still enjoys. But it would be too sanguine to suppose that the progress of amalgamation is halted or that, for all the findings of the Ross Commission, large scale ownership will develop no further. It has too much to commend it in these days when the function of a newspaper is enlarged, not to seem more important than having a soul of one's own. “There are papers which will never be sold, which would rather suffer extinction,” said C. P. Scott, but his idealism was practical. He took measures to prevent the paper from falling into the enemy hands, and since his death the personal ownership of the family has been renounced in favour of a private trust. The scheme by which *The Manchester Guardian* and the *Manchester Evening News* are administered on the basis that every pound they make shall be applied to the paper's good deserves close examination by all those who believe that a newspaper should be a public service and not an instrument of private power or private profit. For the old enemy, now appearing in the fresh guise of Government-sponsored publications as well as the old trappings of ‘cartelism’, must, if he is to be routed, be fought shrewdly and with good weapons.

## YOUNG PEOPLE AND EMPLOYMENT

BY G. A. LORD

THE association of the State with the work of finding suitable employment for young people dates from the time when the Board of Trade established Labour Exchanges in 1909. A few education authorities had previously organized schemes for placing school leavers into employment and these authorities resented the assumption of the Board of Trade that it should be regarded as the official department for this work. As a result there was passed in 1910 the Education (Choice of Employment) Act, which gave local education authorities permissive powers to co-operate with the adult Labour Exchange in dealing with juvenile employment. These joint schemes were, generally speaking, far from satisfactory. They were marred by departmental jealousies and subsequent changes had to be made. These were :

- (1) The Ministry of Labour and National Service was made responsible nationally for juvenile employment.
- (2) Local education authorities were given the power under the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1935, to establish Choice of Employment Schemes for their areas and the Ministry of Labour and National Service undertook to contribute a seventy-five per cent. grant towards approved net expenditure. The education authority is wholly responsible for administering the scheme locally and has the power to appoint its own juvenile employment officer.
- (3) Where local education authorities did not avail themselves of these permissive powers the Ministry of Labour established local juvenile advisory committees and representatives of the education authority were included as members of the committee.

The present organization for assisting boys and girls to secure suitable employment leaves much to be desired and it is expected that many important modifications will be made in the near future on the recommendation of the Committee appointed by the Minister of Labour and National Service on the Juvenile Employment Service and presided over by Sir Godfrey H. Ince.

At the present time there are, therefore, two methods of operating juvenile employment schemes throughout England and Wales, either by the local education authority or by the Ministry of Labour and National Service. While the Ministry of Labour headquarters give to their juvenile employment offices some indication of the methods to be adopted, local education authorities have almost complete freedom in arranging for vocational guidance. In conse-

quence, there is a certain amount of variation in the local administrative arrangements, but, in general, the approach to the boy and girl begins during their last year at school. Many schools are supplied with pamphlets and other reading matter describing the principal industries in the district. In some areas, parties of school-leavers are taken to local works and allowed to see manufacturing processes; in others exhibitions of films and slides are given illustrating possible careers in the particular localities.

Following this introduction to industry, the leaver is required to complete a portion of a school leaver's card, in which he indicates his preferences for employment, particulars of his hobbies and recreations, attachment to youth organizations, if any, and of his father's usual occupation. Another portion of the card is completed by his teacher, where particulars are given of his educational abilities and personal trends, together with a broad classification of the type of employment recommended for him. A medical section includes observations of the school's medical officer made at an examination within six months of leaving school. These report cards are then forwarded to the juvenile employment office from which an invitation is later given to the parents to meet the head teacher and the juvenile employment officer at the school in order to discuss the child's career. The fact that over half the parents invited respond to the invitation is signal proof that it is appreciated by them. The attendance of parents varies, as might be expected, according to the type of locality from which the boys and girls come, but the degree of interest exhibited by the head teacher is a very important factor. These interviews afford a splendid opportunity for discussing the child's future. To a large and increasing number of parents this is a problem which causes them much anxiety. The importance which many parents are placing on a right start for their boys and girls is a very encouraging sign and much of this changed outlook may be attributed to the past efforts of juvenile employment officers. The head teachers also appreciate these conferences for it enables contact to be maintained with the parents and through them with former scholars. At the same time the young person is introduced to the juvenile employment officer with whom he will have many contacts on and after entering employment.

There are two chief considerations to the placing of a boy or girl into employment:

- (1) the correct assessment of abilities and aptitudes, home environment, hobbies, etc., and
- (2) an analysis of the actual work to be undertaken in employment.

It has not yet been found practicable to introduce for all school-leavers a sound scientific basis for arriving at a correct assessment, but it is expected that as a result of the implementation of the Education Act, 1944, there will be a much fuller report than hitherto on the work of the child throughout his whole school career. Psychological tests to assist in securing an accurate knowledge of the child are being increasingly used by some local education authorities, but



these tests demand great expenditure of time and require the services of specially trained persons if the results are to be reliable. In consequence, such testing is generally reserved for selecting boys and girls for various forms of apprenticeships or for further training in vocational subjects. One of the future developments in this direction should be the appointment of a teacher on the staff of each school who should have received special psychological training and whose duties would be primarily to study the abilities and aptitudes of each child. Such information is essential, not only for the purpose of giving vocational guidance, but also for directing the child of eleven years plus to the proper type of secondary education.

The scientific analysis of occupations is largely in its infancy. The war, however, necessitated that each citizen should be utilized as far as possible according to his personal abilities and aptitudes, and not only have the Services adopted psychological methods for testing recruits, but they and many large employers of labour have exercised considerable thought in analysing the qualities required in the individual worker to secure the maximum productive effort.

Vocational guidance to be effective must be supplemented by its counterpart—the finding of suitable employment. It is here that many agencies impinge on the work of the Juvenile Employment Bureau. There is seldom an equilibrium between supply and demand. When supply is in the ascendant, parents, relatives, social workers, are all anxious to assist the boy or girl in finding employment, the opportunities of which may not always be suitable for that particular boy. On the other hand, when demand exceeds supply, employers not only use the Bureau to the fullest extent, but issue advertisements, insert notices in their windows, encourage employees to recruit for them, and have even been known to send representatives to canvass from door to door in order to meet their requirements. As a wartime measure the Minister of Labour and National Service introduced the Undertakings (Restriction of Engagement) Order, which required employers in about sixty per cent. of occupations to recruit their labour through a local office of the Ministry. The Order has now been cancelled, but so far as juveniles were concerned it had many advantages and few, if any, disadvantages. It enabled boys and girls to attend the Bureau and feel confident that particulars of the whole of the vacancies in the area were available for them from which to choose. Their freedom of choice was widely extended while the employer himself was able to offer or refuse appointment to anyone who was submitted to him.

The first placing of a boy or girl into employment should be regarded as of prime importance. Admittedly, at the age of fifteen years it is not difficult to make a change if the first situation proves unsuitable, but from an investigation made by the writer it was found, at the end of twelve months after leaving school, that eighty per cent. of the boys and girls who replied to an inquiry had retained their first situation. This percentage may not apply throughout the country but there is every reason to believe that, through the painstaking effort

of juvenile employment officers over many years, considerable thought is now given both by parents and boys and girls to making the first choice a wise one. But what of the boy and girl who soon become dissatisfied with their work?

During the war years the Essential Work Orders, which required in scheduled undertakings the termination of contracts between employers and work-people to be approved by the Ministry of Labour and National Service, enabled exact information to be obtained on the reasons for the termination of employments. There has been some criticism of the Essential Work Orders, but their application to juveniles had a very steadying and beneficial effect on both employers and young people. The employer was prevented from dismissing a youth without giving to an outside authority an adequate reason for his action, and the youth himself was informed of the reason for his dismissal. This in itself was of great advantage, for previous to the Orders it was quite a common occurrence for an employer to dismiss a youth without giving him any explanation. On the other hand, the youth was prevented from leaving a situation before giving the matter due consideration. In most cases he discussed the matter with the juvenile employment officer and as a result he often withdrew his application for release. Young people are naturally impulsive and many have, on the slightest provocation, left situations offering good prospects of advancement, only to realize afterwards that they had made a serious and perhaps an irremediable mistake.

From a research point of view the Essential Work Orders have been invaluable in enabling fairly accurate information to be obtained from both employers and work-people on the reasons for desiring a change of situation. From an analysis of over 800 such applications received on behalf of juveniles it was found that the principal causes for leaving were industrial and employment conditions (twenty-five per cent.), employment affecting health (twenty per cent.), prospects of better employment (ten per cent.), misconduct (ten per cent.), redundancy (nine per cent.), wages (seven per cent.), home circumstances (4.5 per cent.), inefficiency (3.5 per cent.). Much valuable information on the problem of young people in employment is supplied by a detailed study of several of these headings.

Poor industrial and employment conditions for juveniles were often the result of haphazard recruitment. The foreman was usually responsible for engaging new entrants but, unfortunately, this person is generally selected not for his technical qualities but rather for his personality and drive to ensure maximum production. He is chiefly engaged in controlling adult labour and in most cases appears to have little knowledge of youth. The new entrant is told to perform a certain mechanical operation and after receiving the minimum instruction is required to proceed immediately with that work. Seldom is any explanation given of the type of production undertaken by the firm and the young worker is unable, with his limited knowledge, to realize the essential nature of his particular and often insignificant operation. Only on rare occa-

sions is a boy, on first applying for a situation, shown the factory or work-shop where he will be employed and, in consequence, he has little idea of the type of work upon which he will be engaged. The questions of wages and prospects of training are seldom discussed and the boy who for nine years has received the individual care and attention of the school authorities finds himself bewildered and perplexed by the curt reception given to him on entering industrial life.

Some large firms have realized the advantage to be derived from a gradual introduction of the new entrant into the work-shops. These firms require him to pass through a "reception course" which may occupy one or more weeks. Here are explained the various regulations of the work-shop, the type of article or commodity with which they deal, the various types of production followed, the need for care in operating the machines in order to avoid personal accidents and many other matters which facilitate the transition period.

It has been found too that many ambitious boys soon become disheartened if they are retained by the management on one particular operation over a long period of time while others, not so ambitious, complain most bitterly if they are transferred from one machine to another. Much discontent is created when a boy, once having been promoted to more important work, is required to return temporarily to his former occupation in order to maintain production.

The transition from school to industry increases the working week from twenty-seven and a half school hours to forty-four employment hours and the strain resulting from this drastic and sudden change also affects many boys and particularly girls.

It was rather disturbing to find that twenty per cent. of the applications for release were made on the ground of ill health and at first glance it would appear that industrial conditions are responsible for much sickness among young people. Some industrial processes admittedly affect certain types of individuals more than others but on closer examination it was found that much of the sickness was a continuation of the various health weaknesses which had been prevalent during their school careers.

Misconduct and inefficiency may be considered jointly for they have some bearing on the work of our educational system. The most common forms of misconduct are larceny, insubordination and persistent unpunctuality whilst inefficiency represents inability to perform a certain operation. It must be gratifying both to teachers and educational administrators that so few of the children who have been leaving school at fourteen years of age are unable to perform the work required of them. Thirty years ago complaints were frequently received from employers of labour that the school leaver was insufficiently trained for employment. To-day, one seldom hears that complaint. This may be due primarily to the care which is taken at juvenile employment offices in selecting applicants for situations, but it also emphasizes the fact that the educational foundation laid in the modern secondary schools is sufficient for modern



methods of mass production. Unfortunately, dishonesty, untruthfulness, ununctuality are failings common both to adults and juveniles and are, therefore, no distinctive problem of juvenile employment.

Wage rates often create considerable unrest among juveniles. Not only does high wage encourage some parents to sacrifice the future prospects of their children, but in other cases the boy who is receiving day-work rates frequently becomes unsettled when he finds that his friend, perhaps working at the same firm, is earning on piece-work fifty to 200 per cent. more than he is. Piece-work rates can only be applied where the products and methods of production are of a standardized nature. There is no doubt that this method of remuneration does definitely increase the productive effort. But the fixing of the price for every operation is rather a delicate matter. Should the price originally be fixed too high and require adjustment there is much dissatisfaction on the part of the worker, whilst if one employee earns more than another for the same amount of effort, jealousy and complaints are frequent. Again, many complaints are received from piece-rate workers when through lack of materials, temporary breakdown, and other causes, they cannot be fully employed. If they are asked to accept day-work rates on some other type of work until the shortage is rectified they frequently object. Piece-work rates tend to emphasize the wage rather than the craft.

There is no doubt that the differing wages in the various occupations have prevented many boys and girls from making a wise choice of employment. The extension of the school-leaving age to fifteen years and the establishment of county colleges at which young people under eighteen years of age will be required to attend on two half-days per week will reduce eventually the existing supply of juvenile labour by about forty per cent. Without some measure of control there will be a scramble by employers for the remaining sixty per cent.; wages, being competitive, will rise; the least progressive work will be baited with the highest wage to catch the indiscriminating juvenile. In other words, the advantages to be gained by youth from an extended education under the recent Education Act may be countered to a large extent by economic conditions.

One of the vital problems of juvenile employment is the question who should be responsible for ensuring that boys and girls receive adequate industrial training. Division of labour in modern methods of production has developed to an extraordinary degree. A boy in a foundry may be wholly employed in shovelling and riddling sand; in a furniture work-shop only one cabinet maker is required to twenty or thirty semi-skilled operatives; at a clothing factory, even the pressing of a pair of trousers is divided into several operations, each of which is performed by separate individuals. The repetitive operation exists in most of our methods of production and one can hardly be surprised at the increasing numbers of boys and girls who prefer to become lorry drivers' mates and shop assistants respectively to the more prosaic work of mass production. A knowledge of their daily work enables one to appreciate why they are averse to any

form of activity in their leisure periods. They have been mechanical in their employment and they desire to be mechanical in their leisure. They prefer the cinema to the club.

The industrial greatness of Britain was not built upon such training. It was the widely-trained and skilful craftsmen who obtained our fair reputation for excellency in manufacture. Although the advent of machinery has revolutionized the methods of production, there is still need, as the war indicated, for men and women well skilled in the various trades. Every form of production needs them but industrialists have been living in recent years on our reserves. The method was to get quick returns and it is only recently that the far-seeing employer has realized that so far as young people are concerned quick return methods do not always pay. The question of training in skill is a vital one for the State, for the war has taught us that skill is the foundation of the real wealth of the nation. The State ought, therefore, to insist that youth in industry be regarded not primarily as a producer but as a trainee for future production. Every boy and girl of suitable ability should have training in the various types of work-shop production of his trade during the whole period that he is required to attend part-time day classes.

*(Until his retirement last November Mr. Lord was juvenile employment officer of Dudley for twenty-seven years. For two years, 1943-45, he was President of the National Association of Juvenile Employment and Welfare Officers.)*

## HANNAH GLASSE

BY SAMUEL T. SHEPPARD

[T] is 200 years since the first appearance of "*The Art of Cookery made Plain and Easy*, which far exceeds anything of the kind ever yet published."

Both the book and the author, Hannah Glasse, deserve some sort of bicentenary remembrance, for the book had a remarkable and well merited run of success and the author not only became the target of much criticism but in modern times has been invested with such mystery that, like Mrs. Harris, her very existence has been denied and her memory has been perpetuated by a proverb for which she was not responsible.

The first edition of this famous book was a small folio: the second edition, also published in 1747, was octavo and in that form it continued to appear until the early years of the nineteenth century, and by then over fifty had been issued. In the first three editions the author is described as "A Lady". In the fourth there is a frontispiece which advertises that Hannah Glasse, in Tavistock Street, Covent Garden, was habit-maker to H.R.H. the Princess of Wales, and some editions have Hannah Glasse's autograph in facsimile on the title-page. That Hannah Glasse was indeed the author-compiler of the book on which her name appeared gains support from the fact that when *The Complete Confectioner* and *The Servant's Directory or Housekeeper's Companion* were published in 1760, the author's name was given as "H. Glasse", author of *The Art of Cookery*. How some doubt arose about the authorship will presently be shown, but first some facts about the lady should be considered.

Hannah, daughter of Isaac Algood, of Eglingham, Northumberland, was born on March 24, 1708 or 9. At the age of sixteen she married Peter Glasse, and it was surmised that, being left a widow with slender means, she took to writing and to dress-making in order to support her family. It is also possible that she did not at first publish under her own name because it might offend her brother, Lancelot Allgood, who became a man of such importance in his county as to be knighted. It is, however, dangerous to be led into the realm of surmise as is shown by the analogous case of the most famous of Mrs. Glasse's successors, Mrs. Beeton. The warning comes from Mrs. C. S. Peel, who in *Early Victorian England* says that those who study Mrs. Beeton's book now probably think of that author as "an elderly lady in flowing bombazine skirts and a cap, akin to the mythical Mrs. Grundy, goddess of Victorian convention. In reality Mrs. Isabella Mary Beeton was a pretty young thing and a clever young thing



too. She went to her wedding with Mr. Samuel Orchart Beeton, the publisher, in flounces and a white bonnet, was a clever journalist, produced her masterpiece"—first in sixpenny monthly parts and then, in 1861, in one volume—"gave birth to four little boys and died in her late 'twenties." It is an unexpected picture and, contemplating it, one is left to speculate whether Mrs. Glasse, who sent one of her sons to Eton and another to Westminster, was a Mrs. Grundy of the Hanoverian epoch or whether she was a pretty girl who kept her looks to middle age. She died in 1770. Her book lived on, but the time came when Hazlitt, acknowledging that the book was "very sensible and interesting" could write that she survived "scarcely more than in an anecdote for which I can see no authority. For she did not say 'first catch your hare'." The saying is still often attributed to her, though what she said in her recipe for roasting a hare was "Take your hare when it is cas'd and make a Pudding . . ." In that sense "cas'd" appears to mean skinned and not caught, but it is easy to see how it was misinterpreted. At any rate it became established as a proverbial saying, and it became the basis of a fine pun at the end of the first world war when the possibility of bringing the Kaiser to trial was discussed and should have been ended with the jest: "First catch your Herr, then jug him."

There is no evidence that Mrs. Glasse's authorship of the book was doubted during her lifetime. Even her most bitter critic—Ann Cook, author of *Professed Cookery* of which the third edition was published in 1760—did not think of including that taunt in the bad verses with which she attacked Mrs. Glasse, but it was discussed at a memorable dinner party given by Dilly, a publisher, in 1778, when Dr. Johnson, Miss Seward and others were present. According to Boswell, Dilly said that half the publishing trade knew the book had been written by Dr. John Hill:

Johnson. "Well, Sir, that shows how much better the subject of cookery may be treated by a philosopher. I doubt if the book be written by Hill; for in Mrs. Glasse's *Cookery*, which I have looked into, saltpetre and salt-prunella are spoken of as different substances, whereas salt-prunella is only saltpetre burnt on charcoal; and Hill could not be ignorant of this. However, as the greatest part of such a book is made by transcription, this mistake may have been carelessly adopted. But you shall see what a book of cookery I could make. I shall agree with Mr. Dilly for the copyright."

Miss Seward. "That would be Hercules with the distaff indeed."

Johnson. "No, Madam. Women can spin very well, but they cannot make a good book of cookery."

It is quite likely that Dr. John Hill, who as a member of the Swedish Order of Vasa called himself Sir John, laid claim to the book. He was a botanist and quack doctor who had the misfortune to die of gout, although he had an invaluable specific for that complaint. A long article on him in the *Dictionary of National Biography* describes him as "a versatile man of unscrupulous character, with considerable abilities, great perseverance and unlimited impudence," in fact just the sort of man to seek the credit for a famous best-seller.

His name is included in a list of physicians "who have written the best books of cookery" given by Dr. William Kitchiner in *The Cook's Oracle*, published in 1817; but that fact only shows that the story told by Dilly still lingered. Dr. Johnson had apparently accepted the story and then, being always interested in chemistry, had criticized the book for a slip in chemistry. He did not have the chance of making amends after the manner of Louis XV, who thought only a man could cook until Madam Du Barry showed him he was wrong, and demanded a *cordon bleu* (the Royal Order of St. Esprit) for her *cuisinière*.

It is astonishing how many cookery books have been published in England. Dr. A. W. Oxford has listed them in *English Cookery Books to the year 1850*. E. Smith's *The Compleat Housewife*, first published in 1727, was still selling well when Mrs. Glasse appeared on the scene and ran to eighteen editions. Early in the nineteenth century came a formidable rival in the shape of Mrs. Maria Eliza Rundle's *A New System of Domestic Cookery*, of which the sixty-fifth edition was issued in 1841 and in an amended form the book appeared as late as 1893. Mrs. Glasse then was one in a long tradition of writers, inheriting the wisdom of those ancients who taught the English cooks such arts as how to "boyle a cony with a pudding in his belly," to make "a tart to provoke courage either in man or woman," and more or less to bake four and twenty blackbirds in a pie. Most of these writers started by disparaging their predecessors and by claiming that economy and simplicity could be found only in their own writings. In that respect Mrs. Glasse ran pretty true to form. Her preface says that "in all Receipt Books yet printed there are such an odd jumble of things as would quite spoil a good dish." She fiercely denounces the French, to whom she really owed a great deal, and says: "I have heard of a Cook that used six pounds of butter to fry twelve eggs, when everybody knows, that understands cooking, that half a pound is full enough, or more than need be used. But then it would not be French." It must be owned, however, that there are some weird jumbles in Mrs. Glasse's recipes and what, even in the spacious days in which she lived, must have been regarded as extravagance. To take only one example, her 'rich cake' was made of four pounds of flour, seven pounds of currants, six pounds of butter, two pounds of almonds, four pounds of eggs, three pounds of sugar, half a pint of sack, half a pint of brandy and spices—"this quantity will bake best in two hoops." On the other hand some of her advice has practically been repeated by our Ministry of Food, such as: "Most people spoil garden things by over-boiling them; all things that are green should have a little crispness, for if they are over boil'd they neither have any sweetness nor beauty." Cabbage, she says, and many modern cooks have still to learn this, "is best chopp'd and put into a sauce-pan with a good piece of butter." Was she the inventor of paper-bag cookery? At any rate she gives a recipe for cooking a mutton chop "in half a sheet of white paper, well buttered on the inside and rolled at each end close." Particularly to be commended is the recipe

for muffins, which is followed by an instruction that, after toasting them, they should be pulled open by hand, "and they will be like a honeycomb; lay in as much butter as you intend to use . . . but don't touch them with a knife, either to spread or cut them open, if you do they will be as heavy as lead, only when they are quite butter'd and done you may cut them across with a knife." Very tasty, very sweet, as one of our broadcasters used to say; and Mrs. Glasse ends many recipes with some such comment as "it both looks very pretty and eats fine" or "it is a fine flummery."

Mixed with admirable directions of that kind are many curiosities such as "to make an egg as big as twenty" which was to be done by boiling the yolks hard in a bladder and then putting that ball inside another oval-shaped bladder and boiling it . . . "these are used for grand sallads." Another recipe is for making anchovies—by salting and pickling sprats—which suggests that the latter-day problem: "What is a sardine?" is not the first of its kind. Pickling and preserving of course occupy much space in old cookery books and Mrs. Glasse has followed the general rule about those processes. She even tells how to pickle oysters, which seems at one time to have been a fairly common practice, but it is now out of fashion. Arthur Wellesley, campaigning in the Deccan, sent to Bombay for pickled oysters and it is proof of his courage. In most of those concoctions herbs played a greater part than modern cooks might suspect. Compared with the eighteenth century cooks indeed we are very incomplete herb users. Would anyone to-day think of putting "capers of Astertion buds pickled, or Broom buds" with stewed beef? Nasturtium was a word that always baffled Mrs. Glasse: it appears in a recipe for Salamongundy as "Station flowers" and in another context as "Stertion".

Students of Court life can probably find many instances of Hanoverian influence in this book, but even more interesting are the obvious signs of the influence of the Nabobs. It is hard to credit the fact that a cookery book of 1734 gave no recipe for rice pudding, though Carolina rice was by then well known. Mrs. Glasse gives three recipes for it. She did not appreciate the subtlety of *kababs*, which are usually small bits of meat roasted on skewers with onion or green ginger between them, but she does her best with a recipe for kebob'd mutton. And she did not understand curry, the introduction of which into England is certainly a point in favour of the much abused Nabobs. She knew enough to warn her readers that the rice must be "very thick and dry" and "not boiled to a Mummy." For what would now be called curry powder she advised the use of pepper corns and coriander seed browned over the fire in a shovel, but, as the recipe gives only a large spoonful of rice to two fowls or rabbits, she ignores the cardinal fact that curry should be an adjunct to rice and not rice an adjunct to curry. Coriander seed is recognized by Indians as good for the system and as a carminative, but for curry one wants much more than that; one wants such materials as turmeric, cardamom and cummin. Education in such matters has been very slow, as may be seen in the story



old by Lord Reading that when his father's term of office as Viceroy came to an end he found two compensations for the change from pomp and circumstance in India to the normal routine of life in England. "He was allowed to have money in his pocket again and to pay personally for anything that he bought, and he could once more have curry, of which he was fond, made with curry-powder out of an ordinary tin instead of the rare and strange concoctions which the Princes had been at such pains to prepare for him."

There is an earlier and famous example of failure to appreciate good curry. Thackeray saw the importance of it and introduces it in *Vanity Fair*, written a hundred years after Mrs. Glasse had given her recipe. In order to keep Joseph at home for dinner Mrs. Sedley tempted him by saying: "There's a pillau, Joseph, just as you like it, and Papa has brought home the best turbot in Billingsgate." A page or two later the pillau (more properly pulao) has mysteriously become a curry. "Mother, it's as good as my own curries in India." As an afterthought Joseph said there was perhaps not enough citron juice in it, which was a knowing enough remark, for every curry should have some acid in it, whether lime, lemon or pineapple. But the point is that pulao, for which Mrs. Glasse gives two recipes, is not in the general acceptance of the word a curry. It is a variant of curry and in its plain form, without meat or vegetables, it is served instead of plain rice and eaten with curry. The Sedley's curry, to which Amelia added a chili and in consequence suffered tortures, is the most famous in fiction. There is, however, another that deserves to be remembered. Flurry Knox, in *The Experiences of an Irish R.M.*, inquired: "Did you ever eat my grandmother's curry?—You'd take a splint off a horse with it." That embrocational curry suggests something mustardy out of a tin, such as Lord Reading loved, with the addition of much hot chutney; but the word chutney did not appear in the English language before 1813; it is a post-Glasse condiment.

Dr. Johnson said that when he wrote a cookery book on philosophical principles he "would tell what is the best butcher's meat, the best beef, the best pieces, how to choose young fowls, the proper seasons of different vegetables, and then how to roast and boil and compound." It is obvious that he had not looked very far into Mrs. Glasse's book, for in one chapter she gives full instructions on how to market and states the seasons of the year for various kinds of food. It is one of the most useful parts of the book and contains some curious information. For instance, to test whether an egg is fresh: "Hold the great end to your tongue; if it feels warm be sure it is new; if cold, it is bad, and so in proportion to the heat and cold is the goodness of the egg." As a sure way not to be deceived, the more familiar tests of whether an egg will sink or float in water is also recommended. How, it may be asked, were eggs preserved in the days before the water-glass method had been invented in the middle of the nineteenth century? "As to keeping of them," says Mrs. Glasse, "pitch them all with the small end downwards in fine wood ashes, and they

will keep some months." There are many cautionary words to the marketing housewife which, one feels sure, would not have occurred to the omniscient Johnson. For instance, "the woodcock, if fat, is thick and hard; if new, limber footed; when stale, dry footed; or if their noses are snotty and their throats muddy and moorish, they are nought." And "to know a true leveret, feel on the fore leg, near the foot, and if there be a small bone or knob it is right; if not, it is a hare."

Cooks, like gardeners and farmers until recent times, used the ecclesiastical calendar. "Pork comes in season at Bartholomew-tide and holds good till Lady-Day." "The black venison begins in May and is in high season till All Hallows Day." But for convenience the products of the garden and orchard are more conveniently shown under months, and a surprising variety of apples and pears and vegetables is noted as in season during the winter. Not all the vegetables named would be recognized by teachers of domestic science and even professional gardeners might be excused for not knowing such tubers as skirrets and scorzonera or the sort of garlic called rocombole. That, however, is a small point compared with the real objection to such a list as Mrs. Glasse gives—it could not be universally adopted in the various parts of the United Kingdom.

One further point about the book. Many of Mrs. Glasse's predecessors gave medical prescriptions as well as recipes for cooking food. The former were often horrible mixtures of snails and worms and, as Dr. Oxford says, of "filth and superstitions." Mrs. Glasse avoided that but gave two prescriptions for the bite of a mad dog, one of them "a certain cure", and a receipt against the plague. As to the latter, she says that: "They write that four malefactors (who had robbed the infested houses and murdered the people during the course of the plague) owned, when they came to the gallows, that they had preserved themselves from the contagion by using the above medicine only, and that they went the whole time from house to house without any fear of the distemper." It seems, if true, to be a remarkable example of faith acting as a preventative, almost as remarkable as Mrs. Glasse's prescription for distilling "plague water", a concoction involving no less than twenty different roots, seventeen kinds of flowers and nineteen of seeds.

Mention of Mrs. Glasse is to be found in some odd connections. When Laurence Sterne was in Paris in 1762, he wrote to his wife to bring there various things such as a silver coffee pot, a copper tea-kettle and a cookery book. He did not say which book she was to bring, but if she did not take Mrs. Glasse's she missed a good opportunity for there is much in it that would have interested Sterne's inquiring mind. Some thirty years later the book was read in the saddest circumstances imaginable. The Hon. John Lindsay, of the 73rd Highlanders, was one of Tipu Sultan's prisoners kept in captivity in Seringapatam for several years. He has left it on record that six books were found among the prisoners, "the first volume of Smollett's History of England, the third of

ope, the half of Johnson's Dictionary, a prayer book, and Mrs. Glasse upon the Art of Cookery; these were seized in the same manner (as knives, forks and razors) but with particular injunctions to the guard to deliver them at sunrise and take them back at sunset, from the supposition that, with the assistance of books, in the night, Europeans could do a great deal of mischief when left to themselves." It is pathetic to think of those men, occupying themselves with carpentering, making tables and stools, rat traps, bird cages, a chess board and back-gammon table, eating for the most part rice, curry and very occasionally mutton stew, and thinking of the dishes about which they could read in the cookery book. Not even Polar explorers, planning what they would eat on their return to civilization, can have felt such tantalizing agony as that; but a curious parallel to Lindsay's experience cropped up in a recent court-martial in London during the course of which it was stated that the Japanese in Hong-kong found a cookery book among the possessions of their prisoners, and appropriated it because they thought it was a code book.

The book made a happier appearance in the life of G. A. Sala. After his marriage in 1859 he put his wife into a hansom and told her to go and look for furnished rooms in Brompton. "Then I walked over Southwark Bridge to my work at *The Daily Telegraph*, and on my way, at a second-hand bookseller's, I bought for six-pence a copy of Mrs. Glasse's Cookery book, of which scarcely half-a-dozen copies are known to be in existence. So you see I secured two treasures in one happy afternoon." That book, bound in morocco and interleaved, went for £10 at the sale of Sala's books; but it is not quite so rare as we thought. The second edition, which has been quoted in this article, is more scarce than the first.



## THE SHELL

BY PHOEBE HESKETH

I CANNOT wait for silence and the night  
To gather your lost image to my mind—  
It floats all day beyond my crowded sight  
Till I am blind.

And though I join the city's fevered beat  
Of noise and speed,  
And though my tread is marshalled with the feet  
That throng the burning pavement, cross the street  
In frantic searching for the body's need,  
My spirit cannot feed  
On this mad practice of life's daily creed.

Till standing on an island here alone  
Surrounded by the throbbing and the roar  
Of traffic waves,  
My aching senses faint upon the shore,  
And drown  
In a stronger tide.  
The strangling octopus of town  
Slips through my sight and hearing in a pause  
Of blessed ease . . .

A shell plays on my eardrums with a sound  
Of seas  
Low-washing like a wind through summer trees,  
Until the subtle scent of pines  
Is carried back upon the timeless wings  
Of moments that once lent  
Infinity to each unmeasured hour.

And as the inward-brushing tide  
Sweeps every crescent nearer to my feet,  
Wrapping the rocks in shawls of lace,  
You are at my side,

And in the salty gloom I know your face.  
Your smile touches the darkness,  
And the curving, wide horizon is awake!

But the shell must break—  
It cracks in a thousand fragments underneath  
The hammer of the day.  
The cradled bay  
Is shocked from sleep by concrete city arms.  
And the human cry  
Goes up again in ceaseless, dual strife  
Of circumstance and fate,  
Where work and duty push in front of life,  
Till man rules neither his own soul nor state.

And will the wearing tides of everyday  
Wash your warm image from the fading slate  
Of memory?  
The days drop slowly through the sea of Time,  
And fifty years or one may be too late  
To catch us both together at the gate  
Of chance again.  
Yet forward, backward, though I long and glance,  
I know I cannot wait!

Appear!  
Without the shell upon my ear  
Deceiving sound and sight,  
Reviving memory,  
Without the clear,  
Cold, glassy waves to give me back your face  
In mirrored green,  
And low surf thunder murmuring between  
Your words—  
I'd wish the oceans of the whole world dumb  
If only you would come!

## ON THE HIGH TOPS OF THE CAIRNGORMS

BY RICHARD PERRY

SUMMER is long in coming to the high tops of the Cairngorms between 3,000 and 4,000 feet. A brief three months from late-May to early-August, and the remaining nine months of the year offer the naturalist barely enough material to justify the time and physical energy expended in climbing to his objective.

The 'machine-gun spitting' and belching of ptarmigan, of course, is to be heard on the tops or in the high corries at all seasons of the year, as these little white grouse jink out over the snowy sidings or strut uneasily in and out of the boulders on these arid wastes, pecking at the tips of grasses and sedges. When they attain their full breeding plumage—the cock mantled in dark-grey and black, the hen in dark and light-gold—they harmonize perfectly with the white grit and drab golden-moss strewn with grey boulders, stained purple-black, dark-brown, or bottle-green with pads of cushion-moss. Folding its white wings, on alighting, the ptarmigan crouches close to the ground in a curiously rounded posture and is transformed into the likeness of a moss-stained boulder or a lump of blackish vari-coloured moss, indistinguishable from other tumps and stones scattered around. But, though their colour-comouflage is often perfect, ptarmigan leave a strong ground-scent, which excites my dogs as keenly as that of red grouse or mountain hares.

The worst snow-storms of the winter may sweep the high tops in March and April, and only the presence up there of pipits and golden plover betrays the true state of the calendar. The first half of May is spent before the tops begin to fill, in species, if not in numbers, with summer breeding birds, and the first mountain flowers begin to put forth their greenery—masses of golden saxifrage and the yellow blooms of rooting marsh-marigold in damp places, and the grey-green, lavender-like needles of dwarf-cudweed and lady's-mantle in drier places; while red-tailed queen humble-bees (*bombus Capponicus*) and small tortoiseshell butterflies are to be seen passaging swiftly over the stony plateaux at 3,500 feet. The first wheatear perches on the mossy dome of a little stone bothy which the stalkers use in the autumn; a few dunlin return to feed on the blue crane-flies which perform peculiar rites at the high springs, dancing on their tails on the thick water-logged cushions of black and golden moss; and the rare dotterel—*An t-Amadan Mointeach*, the Fool of the Peat Moss—feeds daintily, with characteristic plover-runs, along the edge of a late snow-field,



er stands fearlessly watching my dogs and myself only a few yards distant. With its white head-stripes and barred wings and flanks, and the rich chestnut and blackish-brown blazon on its belly, the dotterel puts me in mind of a little red-legged partridge. From time to time the more brightly coloured hen-bird arches her tapering wings gracefully, revealing their greyish-white undersides.

At over 4,000 feet on Brae Riach a few dotterel gather together each new spring, and here I have watched them at their *lek* on this gravelly plateau of the Wells of Dee. On the desert of grit a little way from the crystal waters of a burn four dotterel, with hackled feathers, will run at one another aggressively, to the accompaniment of a 'reeling' trilling similar to that of turnstones. Now, two cocks will charge head-on, one leaping over the other and pulling out a feather in passing, before immediately jumping on to the rump of a big hen-bird; now all four run swiftly apart to pick up grit or peck at a fox's dropping; and now two hens, trilling loudly, 'hump' themselves bill to bill, with a greater show of aggression than the cocks, before one runs at an attendant cock, chasing him away. But, after half an hour or so of intermittent display and fighting, they gradually feed further and further apart, and finally make wing over the brow of the plateau and down into the 2,000 foot chasm of Coire Garbh.

By the middle of June there is a smooth, though still rather bleached, greenward of grasses and sedges over the big mosses around 3,000 feet and in the high punch-bowl corries scooped out of the giant hills; and for the first time since the winter snows a great concourse of six or seven hundred red deer feed on these mountain pastures. For the most part they run in sexually discrete herds from ten to two hundred strong, though there is usually a staggie or two with every herd of hinds and their ruddy, white-dappled calves, and one or two big stags with large companies of hinds. The remainder of the big stags, up to one hundred in number, are to be found day after day on their favourite pastures on the higher parts of the moors, where their outlined heads are clearly silhouetted on the skyline more than three miles distant. Though I approach their vast pastures openly over the dome of a hill I usually observe the hinds lying in the peat-hags, much troubled by the flies even at this altitude, or grazing heads down along the green water-courses, long before they are aware of my presence. At any distance from eight hundred to one hundred yards, however, one or two of the hinds become uneasy, pricking their long diamond-shaped ears in my direction; and only then does some drab-yellow old milk-hind utter a lion-like cough. Her alarm is the touchstone to a pandemonium of hindselping and coughing, yearlings blaring like peacocks, calves bleating squeakily, and staggies grunting, as the various companies begin to run together, stopping and starting, from all quarters; and the whole concourse of three, or perhaps, five hundred individuals, the herd of big stags among them, canter across the mosses, and make their way reluctantly up into the high corries, where other herds are grazing or resting.

Sometimes, however, I come suddenly round a cairn to surprise a single hind, usually accompanied by a yearling. Unlike the other hinds she does not trot or canter away, after a preliminary stare, but advances towards my dogs, stamping her foot, and if I sit down to watch her for a while, takes up her stance on a nearby knoll, keeping us under observation. And there she stands, uttering a warning yelp from time to time, while her companion blares persistently, until I go on my way. She has a late calf lying up not very far away.

The season of the return of the deer to the tops is also that of the flowering of the first mountain plants on these snow-bound, wind-swept hills and plateaux. By mid-June a pink flowerlet is to be treasured here and there on a green cushion of moss-campion, and the first pale-pink stars of the creeping azalea replace the minute purple-red whorls of the crowberry, while the brownish-yellow tufts of the cudweed (the Cairngorms' *Edelweiss*) are just discernible. A fortnight later the boggier parts of the mosses are covered with spotted orchises, with here and there a butterwort and more rarely a pale lilac-white marsh violet; while on the banks of water-courses appear the alpine willowherb and in not more than a dozen places between 3,000 and 4,000 feet, the exquisite star saxifrage—that 'London-pride' of the mountains—its fragile white star-flowers branching delicately from a six or nine inch slender reddish-green stem, which grows from a leathery rosette of red, green, and brown leaves.

In drier places are many white flowers of cloudberry and here and there a dwarf variety of cow-wheat, while eyebright and heath-bedstraw reach up to over 3,500 feet; but above all it is the transient flowering season of the Cairngorms' one glory, the moss campion, which, by driving down an immense tap-root, survives, and indeed thrives best, between 3,000 and 4,000 feet, on bare scalds of gravel among the less thickly piled boulders, and on flats and sidings of loose gravel devoid of all other vegetation, except perhaps an occasional patch of bent, reaching out in scattered spores and clumps and little islands, wherever bent and golden-moss fail. And now, on the slopes of Cairn Toul and of Brae Riach clumps of thyme-like flowerlets, varying from palish, almost whitish, pink to the deepest china-pink of centaury, glow in ineffable beauty, their tiny white anthers glistening like diamonds, against the sterile greyish-white gravel. So densely massed are the flowerlets that they conceal the green cushion beneath. But so ephemeral are they that by the middle of July you may search far and wide for a cushion still bearing flowers, and the high tops are already passing in to autumn, with a bright chrome-brown searing the tips of the bents.

It is only at this season that the rarest of the mountain fauna may, or may not come to breed in the Cairngorms. When snow mantled all the tops down to 2,500 feet at midwinter the ptarmigan's only companions in that silent white world had been big packs of 'tinkling' snow buntings, but by the middle of April all these wintering buntings had disappeared, and no more are seen until in the last days of June there is a sudden flash of black and white over the grey

ree of some high corrie near the 4,000-foot contour—it is the cock snow bunting in the full glory of his jet-black and snow-white breeding plumage: perhaps the only cock in all the Cairngorms this particular summer; and then there is a sudden surprising burst of song thrown in to the silent corrie, a brief stanza of lark-like melody, loud, clear, articulate, and musical, ascending in a manner pleasant to the ear; as he sits with flexed legs on his boulder, singing consequently in the intervals of preening, without those laboured physical antics peculiar to other buntings, or as he mounts to some height, crossing from one side to the other of the corrie. In a cranny a foot down beneath the boulders of the scree his more soberly-hued mate has young, and from now on both parents may be watched arriving regularly at the scree with beaks full of crane-flies, which they pick up from the mossy beds of springs. Before the middle of August they will have reared two broods and left the Cairngorms hence more after a stay of less than two months—the shortest of any British breeding-bird.

By the middle of September it is full autumn on the tops, and the herd of big stags have dispersed to their rutting grounds; and early in October stags are wailing and snarling in all the corries and high glens, and lone wanderers, roaring disconsolately, roam the passes. By the end of the month the first snow has fallen, ptarmigan are packed, the first snow buntings have come in to winter, and families of golden eagles sweep and hover over the mosses, hunting ptarmigan, as many as six great birds being within my ken at one time. It is the season of the autumn migration, to be witnessed even in the mountains—of fieldfares and red-wings, of golden plover (not those that nested on the mosses: they left in September) and of grey geese, whose cheery gobbling and honking causes quite a commotion, inciting fusillades of 'crackling' from the ptarmigan packs, while the deer turn their heads right back over their shoulders to follow these noisy travellers.

By the middle of November the rut is nearly over, and more than fifty big stags are couched in one of the lower corries, wherein there may be found henceforward, until they go up to the tops again in June. An inch of snow barely covers the tops with a sparkling mantle: but light though the covering is the snow reveals unexpected forms of life—the tracks of white hares, now extremely scarce in the Cairngorms, and also of stoats, whom I had never expected to exist at this altitude.

By the New Year the tops are quite lifeless, save for the chance hind and calf at 3,000 feet, and absolutely soundless. There are not even the tracks of hares: just the illimitable white waste with its faintly bluish ice-shine, and range upon range of snow-clad mountains swimming above the frost-fog in the straths. Such life as there is lies below the tops, in the corries—packs of grey crows quartering the moors with noisy *quor-rah/quor-rah*, flocks of hundreds of snow buntings in the *allts*, a few ptarmigan running, and unexpectedly sliding and falling, despite their feathered toes, on the steep frozen sidings.



At the end of the month, when there is an overall covering of nine or twelve inches of snow on the tops, not quite burying the heather in the corries, nearly one hundred and fifty stags and staggies of all sizes and ages from knobbers to royals, are feeding in that favourite corrie. At my coming down the hill the whole company mill around, prancing and horning and chasing. But there is, characteristically, no leader among them, and groups and individuals make off at tangents in starts and stops, before the entire herd eventually debauches up the hill.

Thereafter deep snow and frost isolate the tops for a calendar month, and my interest in them is restricted to watching (through my glass) the companies of stags marching along the dazzling white crests nearly six miles distant from my house, and to wondering what the ptarmigan are doing. By the time the snow melts the first pipits and golden plover will already be returning to their nesting grounds on the top, and another mountain season will have begun.

---

## CORRESPONDENCE

### CRITICISMS OF THE CURTIS REPORT

*To the Editor of THE FORTNIGHTLY.*

Sir,

Lady Allen of Hurtwood has interesting and stimulating things to say about the Curtis Report in your March 1947 issue, and no doubt she will herself be taking steps to find answers to those of her questions which were not purely rhetorical—e.g., the reason why out of a very large total number of deprived children so few children are "adoptable".

There is one other point, however, which, if I may, I would like to clarify. Lady Allen mentions "... the Church of England Children's Society (I have not yet been able to discover what connection they have with the Church of England which entitles them to this name)." The reason for the foundation of this Society was that in those days (1881) good care under the auspices of the Church could not be guaranteed to two small boys who became destitute and who were in a Sunday School Class conducted by a young man named Rudolf. He, therefore, set about trying to find ways and means to remedy this, envisaging all the time that primarily the young Society must be the organ of the National Church. He therefore approached the then Archbishop (Tait) and obtained the Primate's consent to give his name "as President of the scheme you advocate." From August 24, 1881, the Society became the officially recognized organization of the Church of England in her corporate capacity, for providing homes for outcast and destitute children.

This identification with the Church has persisted and been strengthened throughout the years and succeeding Archbishops have been Presidents of the Society; the Bishop of London for the time being is President of the Executive Committee. All Diocesan

bishops are Vice-Presidents. The Society's Clerical Organizing Staff is composed of vergymen of the Established Church; and the local parish Clergy invariably act as chaplains to the Branches and otherwise take an intimate interest in the upbringing of the Children. Although children of other denominations are taken into the Society's care if the relatives so wish, it is understood that all are brought up in the faith of the Church.

It is true, however, that we derive only a proportion of our funds from the corporate Church as such, with her many problems of finance, etc. We depend on the general public as well to help us to maintain and extend our work.

Yours faithfully,

W. R. VAUGHAN, Secretary,

Church of England Children's Society.

Kennington,  
London, S.E.11.

#### OLD KOREA

To the Editor of THE FORTNIGHTLY,  
Sir,

May I be allowed to protest against the review of *Old Korea*, by Elizabeth Keith and K. Robertson Scott, in your March issue?

Your reviewer recognized that it is superfluous to criticize a work "for not being something different," and also that "the authors make it clear that they are not describing present conditions" in Korea, but he then proceeds to complain about this book (which I have read) on the basis of what he thinks it ought to contain, namely, an explanation of the structure of Korean society and of the present political conditions and those which immediately preceded liberation. These complaints, and the reviewer's observations, occupy most of the 'criticism', but I am chiefly concerned with his statement that the book "gives an entirely false picture even of the Old Korea." As one who was resident in Korea from 1920 until the end of 1940 I should like to know what grounds he has for saying that the Korean native dress was discarded for general use "a very long time ago." Modifications there have been, and even attempts by the Japanese to enforce sartorial reform, but it is quite untrue that the native dress has been discarded.

Yours faithfully,

A. W. LEE (Rev.), Formerly of the Korean Mission.

Hammersmith,  
London, W.6.

Mr. JOHN MORRIS writes:

I regard it as an important part of the duty of a reviewer to point out the defects of a book. This he can normally do by reference to the actual subject matter. There are, however, occasions when it is necessary to go further than this; and it is not necessarily superfluous to criticize a work for not being something different. In the present case, I decided, rightly or wrongly, to use my space for the purpose of calling attention to a situation on which those of us who are interested in international affairs badly need further information.

I agree with Mr. Lee, however, that my remarks upon Korean dress were too sweeping. It would have been better if I had added "at any rate in the towns" after the word "discarded" in line fourteen of page 228 of your issue for March 1947.

# THE FORTNIGHTLY LIBRARY

## BEFORE THE DISSOLUTION

BY SYLVA NORMAN

**H**ENRY JAMES, American by birth, European by choice, and British by adoption, died during the first world war in 1916. The publication of his unfinished autobiography and two volumes of his letters drew attention to him as a literary figure of some oddity. There was speculation as to what he stood for, whether his later novels repaid the task of reading them, in what way, if at all, he counted, and how far he was already out of date. Worse followed: his readers, a choice minority of intellectuals, were driven to hunting him in second-hand bookshops; he had gone out of print.

This well-chosen selection of his short stories,\* given in progressive order, stretches over thirty years and provides, as it were, a miniature view of James the novelist that is of great value for the "beginner". For the stories echo, in matter, the longer works of fiction, and show a parallel development. After our second war suspicion has, on one ground at least, become a certainty. James, in his outermost aspect, is a period piece, most elegantly removed from this present which is not orderly, cultured or serene enough to harbour him. Though by no means unreadable he is far from general, and what strikes us now, apart from his personal perversity, is his portrayal of a lost social condition—one that has not decently faded, as the furnishings in his quiet old houses fade, but has been violently—and for James too horribly—outraged. Viewed from our footing outside it, his little solar system is seen to be in painfully unstable equilibrium, vulnerable to the forces of disruption, utterly doomed. But to step inside and submit to its rotation is to feel an agreeable sense of relaxation as though the unnatural strain has been in *our* surroundings (and where all is relative, this may indeed be so).

In his own day, even, life was not so free from economic and political troubles as James showed it. But he clung to the narrow stratum of society that he moved in. (A reference to "decent rustics" is his nearest approach to Thomas Hardy's soil.) His people are moneyed, cultured, reserved and social, travelling for pleasure in an art gallery of a Europe, leisured enough to indulge thoughts and speculations to their highest bent. Here is where the characters become "Jamesian"—no longer the mere idle members of a set, but steeped in his personal consciousness, at the mercy of his whim and fantasy. Doubly removed now from the world we all inhabit, they play with mental twists and psychological queries even to the extent of letting these rule their lives. This is especially evident in the shorter stories, for while a single idea dominates a tale, the idea is rarely worked out in a single episode, but greedily eats up a whole career. Repeatedly, in the stories Mr. Garnett has chosen, we may see it happening, often with the help of the supernatural. Sir Edmund Orme, for instance, long since dead, tortures the woman who once rejected him by walking invisibly with her daughter. Lord Mellifont in "The Private Life" is so much a social automaton that when nobody is observing him he lacks existence. In "Maud-Evelyn" a young man vows his affections to a dead girl he has never seen, ignoring the living and expectant one. "The Jolly Corner" is a homestead strenuously haunted by its living owner till he meets in it the self he might have been.

\* *Fourteen Stories by Henry James.* Selected by David Garnett. Rupert Hart-Davis. 15s.



To enjoy the later James, in novels or stories, the reader has to enter this hushed circle most reverently, leaving impatience, hurry, and all practical politics outside. Otherwise one may fall into H. G. Wells's predicament when, as a rest from cosmic anxiety during the first world war, he maliciously attacked Henry James in *Boon*. The present world, he shouted, had no room for James and his embroideries (as though that present world were worthier). In James's narrative method he saw the pivotings of a hippopotamus chasing an uncapturable pea. It was a bitter, peevish action coming after years of personal friendship. James, who could feel the pea under twenty mattresses, was hurt beyond healing, and if he was no more directly killed by criticism than Keats was, yet he died with the taste of it still active.

Mr. Garnett, rescuing the grain of truth from the huge husk of injustice, presents his own metaphor of an aged retriever unravelling complex scents but always at last turning, bird in mouth. Even this kindlier estimate is slightly out of balance; for the dog "gets there", he does something so much finer on the way that the pre-arranged end, when reached, is not always on an equal level. Themes became difficult for James, for whom crude physical experience was not only rare but also, as he saw it, raw, unfinished and inadequately moulded to a pattern. The business of art was to improve on life by dragging the last ounce out of a situation. More and more, during the quiet years at Lamb House, the whole intimate, speculative process tended to represent the clashing and manoeuvrings of his brain. On first coming to Europe, he had found many a subject in the impact of Americans on the European scene. (One of his most vigorous stories, "An International Episode", would seem to have influenced Somerset Maugham in *Our Betters*.) When he dropped this theme, until returning to it in the final novels, no practical widespread drama took its place, to dominate and direct him.

Yet to see in James, as many Americans have done, a renegade from the sources of his inspiration, does not touch the truth. His sources were never exclusively American. The influence of Flaubert, Daudet, Maupassant was strong in him from the outset. Had he remained in his early setting he could not have been the novelist we know—a cultured cosmopolitan with a greater love for his adopted country than most have who were born in it. In an essay commenting on the 1914 war he confessed his quickened emotion for the English vision, and showed himself frankly, almost naïvely, grateful for the cataclysm that could rouse his languid feelings. Here was something shared and tangible; but his literary habits had been set too long for him to grasp at it. He had gone inside himself with his troupe of shadowed characters, chasing their mental twists, diversities, sensations in a stealthy ballet, before coming out into the half light with Q.E.D.

One of the last stories in the present collection, "The Beast in the Jungle", is so much the cream of this later James that one hunts warily for the signature "Max Beerbohm". There are curtains everywhere—between the man and woman, between him and the "something" he is seeking, between all these whispering phantoms and the reader. Meeting the woman in his middle years the man recalls gropingly that he had told her once about this *thing*—invisible, unidentified, the beast in the jungle—which he feels waiting him. She, the elder she, less woman than sybil, believes in it. She grows ill. One day she tells him (poor James could not anticipate our slang) "You've had it"; and he missed it. Then she dies. He goes on hunting for "the lost stuff of consciousness" till it dawns that what he had had and missed was love—her love for him and his for her. So the story ends on what, for James, is a high emotional note. And it is typical of him that the emotion is unshared, entirely introspective, hardly focussed. Yet it is this or nothing. If it looks like nothing we have Wells's hippopotamus, and the fault is in our eyesight. Properly gazed on, the beast changes; Mr. Garnett's

retriever has followed up his scent most faithfully and come home in triumph.

Much could be said of James's style and phraseology: the sudden brief felicities in his involutions, the deliberate slacknesses, the chuckles of humour piercing solemnity, the care in selecting even proper names. His prose, in quality, is remarkably a matter for personal taste. Quite out of the tradition of good English it has for some of us a magical savour that yields an almost immoral satisfaction, so far is it from austerity and yet so controlled. Its final fruition is the perfect instrument for a writer who was looking with perhaps the last appreciative eyes on all things lovely in Western Europe before they were forced into premature decay.

**THE SOVIET IMPACT ON THE WESTERN WORLD**, by Professor E. H. Carr. *Macmillan*. 5s.

**SOVIET FOREIGN POLICY DURING THE PATRIOTIC WAR**, Vol. 2. January 1, 1944 to December 31, 1944. *Hutchinson*. 25s.

The central theme of Professor Carr's interesting and timely little book is stated in its first and last paragraphs. "To-day", he says, "when the open enemies of democracy have once more been overthrown in a victorious war, western democracy is confronted by a new challenge from a country which purports to be the pioneer of a new and more progressive form of democracy—Soviet democracy"; and he closes by stating that "the fate of the western world will turn on its ability to meet the Soviet challenge by a successful search for new forms of social and economic action in which what is valid in individualist and democratic tradition can be applied to the problems of mass civilization." The question which Professor Carr leaves unanswered is what, in his view, is valid in individualist and democratic tradition. "The view that the . . . primary aim of education is to make the individual think for himself is outmoded." If this observation is justified, does it not follow that the individualist and (in the Western view) democratic tradition is outmoded too?

The difficulty in which Professor Carr's omission to define his attitude more precisely in this respect places the reader is, that he has no guidance to help him

decide whether a synthesis between Soviet democracy and Western democracy is possible. For all who are neither Communists nor men of the extreme Right this is one of the fundamental problems of politics, and Professor Carr has not made so substantial a contribution towards solving it as he might have done. None the less, the book is a valuable one.

Its merit lies partly in its refreshingly objective and dispassionate tone, partly in the range of subjects which Professor Carr examines. He states with commendable clarity the nature of the Soviet criticism of Western democracy: that it is formal, purely political, that it lacks "positive belief in itself, and is therefore dangerously tolerant of opposition," and that it makes no provision for the participation of the masses in administration. In passing, the liberal might inquire whether it is lack of positive belief in oneself that makes one tolerant of opposition or whether it is really the weak man who is afraid to stand up to criticism. However this may be, it is in studying the economic effects of the Soviet experiment that Professor Carr is at his best. His exposition of Soviet planning and its relation to our plans for social justice and full employment is most illuminating, as is his analysis of the social discipline in the Soviet system as an advance on the crude discipline exercised by the fear of dismissal. There is, perhaps, an element of over-simplification in the description of the place of trade unions in the Soviet State, but the short study of the conflict of ideas over, and the development of, these institutions under the Soviet régime is full of interest.

What Professor Carr has to say about Soviet foreign policy is not perhaps particularly novel or unexpected, but his analysis of the Soviet search for security in the "protective belt of friendly powers" is well reasoned, while he makes a good point in arguing that economic considerations play a smaller part in the foreign policy of the Soviet than in that of other powers. In fact, the reasonableness of Professor Carr's views on this aspect of Soviet policy is likely to give rise to a good deal of distress and the usual charges of "dishonesty" on the part of the anti-Soviet crusaders in our midst.

The second volume in Messrs. Hutchinson's series of Soviet documents and materials, covering 1944, gives a useful though not particularly exciting survey of the events of that year from the Russian point of view. There are perhaps two features of particular interest. The first is the careful stressing of the secondary, but yet not unimportant part of Russia's Allies in planning and winning victory, and the diverse variations on this theme. The second is the emphasis, exemplifying Professor Carr's description of Russia's foreign policy as "realistic", on the paramount importance of the unity of the Three Powers. Both these are significant of what the Russian is taught to think.

W. T. WELLS.

**YEARS OF CRISIS**, by Kenneth Ingram. *Allen & Unwin*. 21s.

Mr. Ingram is too much of a prophet to be able to disguise himself convincingly as a historian. His publishers say that the reader will obtain from this book such a comprehensive picture of a world in crisis that he can draw his own moral conclusions. But as we follow the path which Mr. Ingram has carved through the jungle of the years 1919-1945, we feel that we are being led for a purpose. What this purpose is, becomes apparent only towards the end of the journey.

In the first part of the book we are transported into the frame of mind we

knew in the inter-war years (the more effectively, perhaps because the author has never completely succeeded in freeing himself from its toils), generous to acknowledge our own failings and fatally willing to whitewash the crimes of our neighbours. We are shown the economic weakness of our civilization and the persistence of that mutual suspicion which severed East from West and provided Hitler with an opportunity he was quick to seize.

The second part tells the story of the second world war. But it is a story which is periodically interrupted to remind us that the war against the Fascist powers conceals a more fundamental social conflict which will rage even more fiercely when open hostilities have ceased.

In a volume of less than 500 pages of well-spaced type there is not room to substantiate comments such as this and the result is a book which falls disappointingly between the two stools of history and politics. Presumably for lack of space, no attempt has been made to define either communism or fascism, although both terms are freely employed. Nor is any comparison made between the two systems save for the debatable opinion that, in the inter-war years, "those who identified bolshevism and fascism overlooked the fact that the Soviet Union desired no territorial expansion."

The actual course of the war is accurately and lucidly described; in particular, the account of the German advance on Moscow moves forward with vigorous intensity. But by a grievous omission there is not a map or diagram throughout the book. (At one point we are actually asked to make a mental map of the area covered by the advancing Russians.) Compared with the Russian front, the European campaigns receive scant attention. Without due consideration of its strategic context, the Italian campaign is dismissed as "a heavy debit on the Allied balance-sheet"; while Montgomery's masterly handling of the Battle of Normandy is sketched only in bare out-



line. Other examples of a lack of balance could be quoted—for instance, the assertion that ultimate victory was 'mainly due' to the magnificent achievements of the Resistance movements. Nevertheless the reader will enjoy this sincere attempt to see the period of our own lives in historical perspective.

NIGEL BRUCE.

**ENGLISH CHURCH MONUMENTS, 1510 to 1840**, by Katharine A. Esdaile. With an introduction by Sacheverell Sitwell. *Batsford*. 21s.

One of the major disservices done by the Gothic revival of the nineteenth century was to draw rigid architectural frontiers. Anticipating the political frontiers of a century later the medievalists of that day imprisoned themselves within an 'ideology'. The Iron Curtain fell and is still only partly lifted. Its position was determined not by a line in geography but by a point in time. That point was fixed, for English students of architecture, at the Reformation. Since it is true that few churches were built between the middle of the reign of Henry VIII and the later Stuarts, it was convenient to assume that nothing worth while was built afterwards. The political facts and the introduction of Italian models and influences helped to support this theory of the clean break. A monument of falsity has been erected on this foundation. Tradition has been ignored or flouted. No sense survived of craft or custom handed down; of skill and delight in workmanship. As though the unknown masons and carpenters whose memorial is inscribed in every medieval building had exhausted the possibilities of their art and left no successor.

Blinded eyes are now opening. The whole body of British architectural art and the arts dependent upon it is being examined bit by bit. Mrs. Esdaile writes the first important book on post-Reformation monuments. With such help we can embark on a new study—

almost anywhere: in Westminster Abbey or a country church. We may all deem ourselves unlearned in this subject; but if we are unsophisticated so also are the parishioners of many a church who have been able to oppose only their own common sense and conservatism to the active destructiveness of an incumbent. They have been conscious, no doubt, of some feeling more respectable than mere dislike of change. What if it were an unconscious response to conscious art? What if they realized, however vaguely, the beauty of that which has been so long despised? And what if they could appreciate that these also were objects of piety—not an obstacle to worship, as unhappy fanatics call them, but an aid, since they were designed for this place as a memorial to the dead?

To turn the pages of this book, and to look first at the plates, as every reader will, is to reinforce all such feelings by the beginnings of an understanding of the variety and beauty of English sepulchral art. Of course there are oddities, as in the medieval misericords and elsewhere. There is a low relief of highwaymen attacking a coach. A carpenter carries his bag of tools. A goat is eating a cabbage. A handsome cock pheasant is lifting a dainty foot. The tombs commemorate not the noble and great alone. We may find a forester, a miner, gamekeeper, housekeeper, shoemaker, watchmaker, wrestler. The beasts of heraldry come to life in colour and carving. The Hanoverian wig bestows more than opulence upon its wearer. "Reading from the pictures", as in childhood, we find it easy and delightful to accompany Mrs. Esdaile in her story of the development of the later monumental styles, of the men who designed and carved them and the materials in which they worked. The story links the tradition with the medieval centuries—deliberately overlapping, for this purpose, by showing examples from the fifteenth century. It is the same, not a different, story which is pursued through

Tudor, Stuart and Hanoverian times into early Victorian. Nor need it stop there.

Mrs. Esdaile has recovered from oblivion the names of many sculptors, English, Huguenot, Flemish and others who worked here, or has added to our knowledge of those known already. One of these is the picturesquely named Epiphanius Evesham, a Herefordshire man whose early Jacobean masterpieces can be seen in the Abbey and traced in the churches of Kent, Essex and Lincolnshire. At least thirty other masons or sculptors have been identified, and something of their lives made known. This implies painstaking research: here very modestly displayed. We have emphasized the importance of these monuments as works of art; Mrs. Esdaile brings out other aspects, such as their historical and documentary interest. It is unlikely that this

book will be supplanted: it may be hoped that the author will supplement it. Mr. Sitwell writes a suggestive introduction. This is his period also, and Mrs. Esdaile's work is complementary to his *British Architects and Craftsmen, 1600 to 1830*; and to F. H. Crossley's *English Church Design, 1040 to 1540*. Mr. Sitwell relates this English work to its affinities in Spain, Italy, South Germany and elsewhere and finds the comparison creditable to the English artist.

W. THOMSON HILL.

**CHILD OF WONDER.** An Intimate Biography of Arthur Mee by Sir John Hammerton. *Hodder & Stoughton.* 12s. 6d.

Arthur Mee was author or editor of an impressive number of works, from the

*Number 4, March 1947, now ready*

# The Trollopian

EDITED BY BRADFORD A. BOOTH

Beginning in June THE TROLLOPIAN, the Journal of Victorian Fiction published by the University of California Press, will appear quarterly in June, September, December and March. The annual subscription in Great Britain is 16s. 6d. net. Single copies cost 5s. net each. Enquiries and subscriptions should be addressed to Bentley House, 200 Euston Road, London, N.W.1.

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

forty-eight parts of *Harmsworth's Self-Educator* to the thirty-seven volumes of *The King's England*, a work somewhat extravagantly described as 'A new Domesday Book of 10,000 Towns and Villages'. Mee was fond of round numbers. His second serial venture *Harmsworth's History of the World* provided '10,000 pictures of 10,000 years'; later there was 1,000 *Beautiful Things*, and *Arthur Mee's* 1,000 *Heroes* and many more. His output was enormous: he claimed at one time to write a million words a year. Sir John Hammerton, his collaborator in several ventures, suggests that this was possibly an exaggeration, although no one will deny that his energy was prodigious, his enthusiasms unbounded and his influence great. Indeed it is difficult to estimate how many thousands of children have been reared on *The Children's Encyclopaedia*, or its successors *My Magazine* and *The Children's Newspaper*.

Others have compiled works, the chief value of which lies in the information they give or the inspiration they impart, but never with the success achieved by Mee. Yet he was not an accomplished writer: his work, Sir John suggests, was only "somewhat above the standard of good journalism," and lacked "that indefinable something which would have made it lasting literature." His real merit as a writer was "the inspirational quality" of everything he wrote. He was to the end a child of wonder, and he was able to pass on to the reader the wonder and enthusiasm he had experienced himself. And as a maker of books he had no rival. He visualized the finished production, often before he had started writing the book or planning it in detail. The appearance of a book sells many more copies than publishers care to admit, and in his lavish use of illustration, his choice of title, his skill in sub-editing and making almost any subject look interesting by the frequent use of paragraph headings, he had no equal.

His reading was limited mostly to

newspapers and works of information, and he rarely read for pleasure. In fact it seems that he wrote more than he read. Much of his writing was based on his vast collection of newspaper cuttings, thousands and thousands of them, all carefully classified in large envelopes so that an article on any subject could be produced at short notice.

Sir John Hammerton knew Mee for over forty years and records carefully the stages of his career, from his humble beginning as a reporter in Nottingham to his later days of affluence and success with the Harmsworths. It is a generous but uninspiring tribute: this is not, one feels, the real Arthur Mee, the legendary author of a hundred books, the inspired editor of *The Children's Newspaper*. Mee deserves a better book than this, and one wishes that some of his magic could have been transmitted to the biographer, and through him to the reader.

C. W. SWINSON.

### THE BRITISH MUSEUM LIBRARY, by Arundell Esdaile. *George Allen & Unwin, Ltd.* 15s.

Mr. Esdaile, who started his career in the library section and became secretary of the Museum, has done a service to the public in making known through his book the history of this great collection. There are few visitors to this country from overseas who do not allocate a portion of their time to visiting the library of which Sir Frederic Kenyon in his introduction to Mr. Esdaile's book says: "The British Museum is, next to the British Navy, the National Institution which is held in most respect abroad."

In his preface the author points out that the book should really be considered as the first of three volumes which would be needed to complete the task, and it is to be hoped that these will appear some day either from his pen or from that of another. Mr. Esdaile has confined himself to the departments of Printed Books and Manuscripts, and Oriental Printed Books and Manuscripts.



Now that by law a copy of every published book has to be deposited with the Museum it is perhaps taken for granted that this was always the case. But at one time it had to acquire by gift or purchase what it wanted.

The Museum was created by an Act passed in 1753 and the library of Sir Hans Sloane of Chelsea was the first big collection of books to become the property of the nation. As time went on, other collections were acquired and other books became the property of the Museum by gift and these have been carefully traced. It is notable how during the whole period of the library's existence, whenever a very rare treasure has been in the market, there has had to be a constant fight by the trustees with the Treasury to get funds allocated for buying it; or for the purpose of acquiring the land or erecting the extra buildings needed to house the ever growing collection.

The history of the Museum book catalogue which is to be found in the centre of the reading room makes most interesting reading. It is fascinating to see how the Herculean task of incorporating the various catalogues into a whole has been accomplished, for while this is being done the cataloguers must keep pace with additions. It would, I think, be hard to find in any part of the globe a more complete and better arranged catalogue, which, we are told, was patronized by most of the great writers of the last generation. And that is probably equally true to-day.

An account of the evolution of the various departments and appendices giving the names of the trustees and various keepers of all the different departments (the names are now to a large extent history) are included. But what is perhaps more interesting still is the short history of the reigns of the keepers of printed books from the start and the various influences which each had on the collection as a whole.

It is to Panizzi that posterity owes the

erection of the reading room as we know it to-day. This is perhaps the best known part of the vast library to its users, but comparatively few stop to think who its creator was. It can be said that Panizzi probably left a greater mark on the whole structure of the library than any of his predecessors in office had done.

Mr. Esdaile has spent the greater part of his working years in the Museum and his book is a labour of love, on his retirement, to show students how and by whom their reference library was formed and brought to its present great position.

J. A. WALEY COHEN.

**SUMMER'S LAST WILL AND TESTAMENT**, by Constant Lambert. *Oxford University Press. Three guineas.*

For a long time book publishers have appealed to the collector's instinct by the

## HEFFER'S of Cambridge

*The bookshop known the World over*

**ENGLISH & FOREIGN  
NEW & SECONDHAND**

*Buyers of: FINE, RARE  
& SCHOLARLY BOOKS*

*Catalogues issued*

**W. HEFFER & SONS  
LIMITED**

Petty Cury · Cambridge



production of luxurious limited editions, signed by the author, and more recently this vogue spread to the realms of music. Such lavish productions were naturally halted by war conditions, but the Oxford University Press has made a fresh start in this direction with the vocal score of *Summer's Last Will and Testament* by Constant Lambert, with drawings by Michael Ayrton.

The present edition is limited to 150 copies, of which one hundred, signed by the composer and the artist, are for sale.

The score is a large folio of some seventy-eight pages, with six drawings. Aesthetically it is difficult to balance a page of music, with its abundance of necessary detail, against the illustrations; but Hubert Foss, who supervised the production, is to be congratulated on his solution of the problem. He has contrasted clearly-defined scores of music of a relatively small note size against the bold drawings of Michael Ayrton, so that the pages present the fairly even blackness which is satisfying to the eye. The layout and engraving of the music is in itself an artistic achievement, which reflects credit on the firm of Henderson & Spalding. It would be unfair to criticize the poor quality of the paper: the publishers would certainly have used better if it had been available for this otherwise handsome production.

The music is in the form of a masque for orchestra, chorus and baritone solo, to words taken from the Pleasant Comedy entitled *Summer's Last Will and Testament* written by Thomas Nashe in 1593. After an orchestral *Intrata* consisting of a *Pastorale* and *Siciliana*, "Fair Summer droops" is set as a *Madrigal con ritornelli* for chorus and orchestra. Then follows a similar setting of the well-known words "Spring, the sweet Spring" in the rhythm of a *Coranto*. A bacchanalian frenzy is reached in the *Brawles* "Trip and go", which end on a quieter note with some clever choral vocalization on "Ah" merging into a few bars of humming.

The fifth movement is another *Mad-*

*rigal con ritornelli*, the words being "Autumn hath all the Summer's fruitful treasure." This is followed by the orchestral *Rondo Burlesca* "King Pest", which is sometimes heard in the concert hall as a separate item. Then comes the final "Adieu! Farewell earth's bliss", set as a stately *Saraband* for baritone solo, chorus and orchestra.

The whole work is imbued with the spirit of a modern renaissance—the twentieth-century counterpart of the Elizabethan spirit in literature and music. The settings, modern as they are, fit the sixteenth-century poetry of Thomas Nashe perfectly. The verses were written against a background of plague and pestilence, and this is reflected not only in the music—particularly in "King Pest" and the final *Saraband*—but also in Michael Ayrton's drawings. In them the imagination of a Blake is combined with the rugged draughtsmanship of a Dürer into something essentially modern in its forcefulness.

*Summer's Last Will and Testament* was first performed under the composer's direction at a B.B.C. Symphony Concert at Queen's Hall in January 1936. In addition to the baritone solo and chorus it requires a full modern orchestra, including two harps. But one can gain little idea of the orchestration from the present vocal score, in which the orchestral part is realized in terms of a piano duet. The composer says: "Although much of this vocal score is playable and effective as a piano duet, the arranger, Mr. Archibald Jacob, has at my request supplied a clear presentation of the contrapuntal texture of the full score rather than a pianistic transcription. It is to be regarded primarily as a student score enabling those who have not seen the full score to obtain a fair idea of the music." Why, if this is so, is the orchestration not more clearly indicated in the arrangement? There are less than a dozen indications of instrumentation scattered about the piano part and the student is left guessing as to how the composer has

coloured the bare notes in his orchestration. This is a serious omission: a little extra care could have made the score so much more valuable.

EDGAR HUNT.

**THE CONCERTGOER'S HANDBOOK**, by Hubert Foss. *Sylvan Press*. 15s.

How pleasant to compile such a book as this! A personal reaction, perhaps, but quite in keeping with this very personal book. It is a tribute to Mr. Foss to say that he has pleased himself in writing it, for his evident enjoyment and enthusiasm shine through the text as happily as they pervade one of his broadcasts. But more than charm is required to justify the appearance of yet another handbook, and this one must stand or fall by its aims and achievements like any other.

One of the author's intentions, as expressed in the preamble, was to produce a concise book "which offers just the right amount of knowledge and proper understanding necessary for the immediate situation, but no more." This statement might lead one to expect a concise version of Percy Scholes's *Companion*, but no such comparison is possible or desirable. Mr. Foss's virtues are harder to define, if no less sound, than are those of Dr. Scholes, and he is entirely on his own ground as far as this book is concerned. He treats music as an art, not as a technique, and all within the frame of a self-indexed book. To quote again: "The method tries to be expository—that is to say, it tries rather to discuss the musical result of facts than the facts themselves." From this point of view Mr. Foss succeeds admirably.

The conciseness which has been aimed at in this work of limited scope necessitated many omissions, and although the precise nature of these has been dictated by the author's personal fancy, for which he makes no apology, there is good sense behind most of them. One is less happy about the omissions of contemporary

names. Mr. Foss has expressed his awareness of the difficulty of the position without lessening one's irritation at discovering, for instance, that the three people to whom the book is dedicated claim a paragraph each for their scholarship and that Nadia Boulanger and Dr. E. H. Fellowes, two of the other great names in this sphere, receive no entry.

However, the most successful aspect of the book is not its reference value but its human quality of readableness and its clear artistic exposition, well atoning for any incompleteness which only larger books can avoid. To widen the usefulness of the Handbook, by leading the reader on to fuller sources of information, a bibliography is appended which, though not exhaustive, should prompt many to visit a library.

PHILIP MORRIS.

"WHOSOEVER will, let him take the WATER of LIFE freely". (Rev. xxi., 17)

**WATER**

and the

**SPIRIT**

THE

**NEW SACRAMENT**

FOR THE

**NEW DISPENSATION**

For **HEALING** and **DELIVERANCE**  
in the **TRIBULATIONS** now in  
evidence preceding the **COMING**  
of the **LORD**

Write to

**THE PANACEA SOCIETY,**

Bedford, England

**THERE IS NOTHING TO PAY**



## BOOKS ON THE TABLE

THE assertion that material progress has failed to make the human race happier is in danger of becoming a cliché. If those who make it just to be in the fashion stop to think, and take L. T. C. Holt's *HIGH HORSE RIDERLESS* (*Allen & Unwin*. 10s. 6d.) for a guide, they will discover nevertheless that they have 'said a mouthful'. It is hard to deny that "knowledge and wisdom, work and leisure, art and religion, life and death become indivisible parts of one art, the art of the good life," for otherwise the horse of destruction must gallop on riderless to destruction. The author has summarized his thesis under twenty headings, each of which would stretch the powers of a discussion group, however earnest. To quote any one of these would be unfair to the other nineteen but a few of his chapter headings will hint at the scope of the book: "The City at Play", "at Work", "at Home", "The Twilight of the Arts", "Education for Freedom", "Work and Wealth",—with superb photographs throughout to 'highlight' the argument.

**Finding the facts**

Fresh from this concern with the sublime it is disconcerting, though far from ridiculous, to read that Aston Villa and Sheffield United football clubs began in a Sunday School. So says the latest broadsheet of *PLANNING* (*Political and Economic Planning*. Annual Subscription £2), which is devoted to CLUBS, SOCIETIES AND DEMOCRACY. The attributes of the groups, independent of the State, into which the British have long been accustomed to form themselves are here examined with a view to discovering what part they play as vehicles of democratic activity and to how many people they bring awareness of the meaning of citizenship. The information in these twenty pages should be invaluable to the

student of sociological problems or to any general reader curious about the way democracy works, and the appendices containing the names of societies, foundation dates, membership statistics, etc. are particularly helpful.

"PEP is an independent, non-party association for economic and social research . . . It does not seek to propound any political doctrine as such, but to formulate opinions which flow from the discovery and study of the facts." This is its watchword and for more than ten years it has been publishing every three weeks or so full-scale reports which are a concentration of much laborious and patient investigation.

**Thoughts for to-day**

Democracy restores to man a consciousness of his value, teaches him by the removal of authority and oppression to listen only to the dictates of reason, gives him confidence to treat all other men as his fellow beings, and induces him to regard them no longer as enemies against whom to be on his guard, but as brethren whom it becomes him to assist.

Not as might be supposed from either of the foregoing but from Godwin's *Political Justice*, written in 1793. How far short the world is to-day from his ideals of government may be gauged anew from George Woodcock's *WILLIAM GODWIN* (*Porcupine Press*. 12s. 6d.). This biographical study attempts to rectify the modern neglect of Godwin in favour of the achievements of his contemporaries. He is often only remembered for the sweet sake of Shelley, the son-in-law on whom he incessantly sponged. But Mr. Woodcock proves that Shelley's intellectual debt to Godwin was at least as great. In fact, the latter's philosophy had an enormous influence on all in that circle of poets and thinkers who gathered about the Shelleys. The author gives a full analysis of the works, especially the once famous *Enquiry Concerning Political*

justice, which, as this is practically unobtainable now, puts the reader in his debt and shows moreover that Godwin's principles of truth and freedom are still pertinent.

### Pre-Boswell

When Godwin was born Samuel Johnson was already celebrated, combining the role of Tory and High Churchman with contempt for patriotism, slavery and aristocratic patrons. Part X of *JOHNSONIAN GLEANINGS* by Aleya Lyell Reade, "Johnson's Early Life: The Final Narrative" (privately printed for the author by Lund Humphries. 21s.), is the ripe fruit of forty years' research. How wide this has been may be gathered from other titles in the series, such as: "Notes on Dr. Johnson's Ancestors and Connections", "Francis Barber, the Doctor's Negro Servant", "The Jervis, Porter and other Allied Families", as well as three books on the Doctor's boyhood and on his life between 1728 and 1740. The whole is indeed a labour of Mr. Reade's love, scrupulous in scholarship and at its rightful post beside, and complementary to, the Boswells.

### as she is spoke"

By a natural transition, the great *Dictionary* being in mind, *USAGE AND ABUSAGE: A Guide to Good English*, by Eric Partridge (*Hamish Hamilton*, 15s.) comes next. This is great fun, rather more for the author than for the sometimes rueful reader. The essays on "Jargon", "Colloquialisms", "Slang", "War Adoptions" and "Vogue Words" remind us how miserably dependent through laziness most of us are on the inexact word or phrase and of how quickly we rub the bloom off the novel or ultra (this, says Mr. Partridge, "fortunately is obsolescent"! ) expressive. Most of us would avoid misusing 'while' as in Sir Alan Herbert's example: "The curate read the first lesson while the rector read the second," but, after an intensive course of 'which', 'what', 'that', 'who' or 'whom' under Mr. Partridge's tutelage,

some may be doubtful evermore which, or what, to use. This of course is no criticism of him but of those who make a 'utility' makeshift of Shakespeare's tongue instead of the luxury that, or which, it is.

### What literature is

As Keats said: "English must be kept up" and Basil Willey re-inforces the plea in *THE "Q" TRADITION* (Cambridge University Press. 1s. 6d.) and who better? Professor Willey, on his appointment to the King Edward VII Chair of English Literature at Cambridge, made this his inaugural lecture and goes some way in proving his fitness to succeed Quiller-Couch when he says:

This is still the defence of literary culture in our time, as it was in Arnold's that by learning and propagating the best that has been thought and said in the world, it may help to make reason and the will of God prevail.

And he applies his argument to the individual in 'Q's' own words:

The man we are proud to send forth from our Schools will be remarkable less for something he can take out of his wallet and exhibit as knowledge, than for being something, and that something recognizable for a man of unmistakable intellectual breeding, whose trained judgment we can trust to choose the better and reject the worse.

### Poetry from Italy

How two Englishmen have used their considerable literary gifts to express the thoughts of an Italian and of a Chinese may be judged by two books of poetry on the table. The first is *POEMS FROM GIACOMO LEOPARDI* (John Lehmann. 7s. 6d.), translated and introduced by John Heath-Stubbs, who says he has tried to produce work which will convey the poetic quality of Leopardi to the reader unacquainted with the original. Born as he was at the end of the eighteenth century he was surprisingly little influenced by the Romantic movement of the nineteenth. His isolation may be inferred by his indifference to Byron's poetry which on the Continent, at any rate, was much more than a vogue. Mr. Heath-Stubbs feels that probably "the deepest affinity



of Leopardi among English poets is with Wordsworth" but does not push this far; though the very first poem in the book does bring Wordsworthian echoes. Mr. Heath-Stubbs is remembered gratefully for himself of course as one of the more outstanding of the young *Routledge* poets of a year or so ago.

### Chinese philosophy

THE WAY OF ACCEPTANCE, a new version of Lao Tse's *Tao Tê Ching*, by Hermon Ould (*Andrew Dakers*. 5s.) is the second book. The author claims that his "version" is an "intelligible paraphrase of a famous manual of philosophy" the teachings of *Tao Tê Ching* being "paradoxical, elliptical, antinomial—in a word, difficult." This work was probably written about four hundred years before Christ—and its wisdom is dateless. Mr. Ould explains that the trend of his own reading hitherto had been towards Indian philosophy rather than Chinese. His renderings confirm this, and to say that they sound like Rabindranath Tagore is, from this reader, very high praise indeed. For instance:

How shall water become clear save by keeping still?

It is by the still and the motionless that life is quickened.

Those who follow the Tao do not crave replenishment;

Always satisfied but never surfeited, they are ever-renewed.

### Contemporary writing

Number 14 of MODERN READING, edited by Reginald Moore (*Phoenix House*. 6s.), departs from the style of its predecessors; it is not paper-covered and some new features increase its size. Among these John Steinbeck and Gustav Fechner, the authors considered in "Writers and Their Work", receive the competent treatment of Lewis Gannett and Henry Miller respectively. Both

Americans, the English of these two has that pungent, alert and concise quality, without either facetiousness or *March of Time* solemnity, which can be most attractive to readers this side of the Atlantic. Its stories, essays and poems seem to justify the contention that *Modern Reading* "offers its readers a cross-section of what is being currently thought and done by significant British and American authors." But when the Editor says: "Whilst drawing from the literary movements of our time we shall resist becoming the handmaiden of any one of them" he is being unnecessarily portentous.

### Produce of Ireland

Maura Laverty is a novelist who grows. *Alone We Embark* and *Never No More* appeared to be worthy of all those encomiums reserved for Irish writers fortunate enough to have an eloquent sponsor. Now comes *LIFT UP YOUR GATES* (*Longmans*. 8s. 6d.) which makes one wish to have read her story book for children, *The Cottage in the Bog*, so well does she understand the mind of a little girl. Her tender study of Chrissie, in a Dublin slum, who sold the convent dinner can lent her by kind Sister Martha to buy a smaller boy a chocolate roll, is a beautiful piece of work. The crushing guilt that is the sensitive child's special hell becomes the reader's—who also shares that magical lift of the heart at the end when Sister Martha shows her confidence in Chrissie. Then those slums—the sinks of poverty, smells, rats, drunkenness and ignorance that are somehow always magnified in the shadow of the Roman Catholic Church—how they come alive, in all meanings of the word, under the author's delicate touch! Maura Laverty is a prophet with honour—but, I wonder, save in her own country?

GRACE BANYARD.

ADVERTISEMENT AND BUSINESS OFFICES: 4, 5 & 6, SOHO SQUARE, LONDON, W.1

PUBLISHED FOR THE FORTNIGHTLY REVIEW, LTD., BY HORACE MARSHALL & SON, LTD.,  
Publishing Department, Temple House, Tallis Street, E.C.4

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY GEEBINGS OF ASHFORD, LTD., 80 HIGH STREET, ASHFORD, KENT  
PUBLISHED IN ENGLAND